DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 433 EC 120 117

TITLE	Evaluation of the Process of Mainstreaming Handicapped Children Into Project Head Start. Phase I: Final Report. Volume II: Reference Tables.
INSTITUTION	Applied Management Sciences, Inc., Silver Spring, Md.
SPONS AGENCY	Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	24 Oct 78
CONTRACT	105-76-1113
NOTE	298p.; For related information, see EC 113 810-811
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC12 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Demography; Enrollment; *Handicapped Children; *Mainstreaming; *Preschool Programs; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

The booklet presents the reference tables for the Phase I Final Report on the Evaluation of the Process of Mainstreaming Handicapped Children Into Project Head Start. Data presented focuses on three areas: program-specific data on Head Start programs, child-specific data for sample handicapped children, and program-specific data on non-Head Start programs. Instruments used in the study included questionnaires, interviews, and observations. Among the purposes of the study were: 1) to describe the enrollment and termination procedures used, and the types of handicapped children enrolled, in the various preschool programs; 2) to describe facilities and equipment in Head Start centers; 3) to determine program demographic characteristics; 4) to describe services provided to the child; 5) to determine the extent of social integration of the child in the classroom; 6) to describe the characteristics of the child's service providers and the types of services provided; 7) to analyze the child's diagnostic file; 8) to determine program characteristics and services typically provided to handicapped children; and 9) to describe program facilities and equipment. (DLS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED1764333

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

G-93

EVALUATION OF THE PROCESS OF MAINSTREAMING HANDICAPPED CHILDREN INTO PROJECT HEAD START

PHASE I FINAL REPORT, VOLUME II

REFERENCE TABLES

October 24, 1978

Prepared for:

Administration for Children, Youth and Families
Office of Human Development Services
Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Pursuant to:

Contract No. HEW 105-76-1113

EC120117

962 Wayne Avenue • Suite 701 • Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
Telephone 301 585-8181

APPLIED MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

To the Reader

In all, ten different data collection schedules were used in the Phase I study to evaluate the process of mainstreaming handicapped children into Project Head Start. This report presents item-specific raw frequency distributions for data obtained in eight of these forms. Form 5, Part B of the Facilities Walk-Through Checklist and Form 6, the Diagnostic Record Review, are not included in this report because the nature of the data contained in these forms were of a nature which precluded the development of meaningful and easily interpretable frequency tables. Data from both of these forms, however, were used in the development of Volume I of the Phase I final report. It should be noted that this volume also excludes selected items from several other Phase I forms for similar reasons.

A complete set of the Phase I data collection schedules is appended to the Phase I Final Report, Volume 1.

EXHIBIT 1.1: STUDY INSTRUMENTATION

Focus	Instrument	Purpose	Source	Method
Program-Specific Data on Head Start Programs	Primary Data Interview Schedule	Describe enrollment and termination procedures and types of handicapped children enrolled	Head Start Director	Mailed questionnaire or personal interview
	Facilities Walk-Through Checklist, Section A	Describe facilities and equipment in the Head Start centers	Head Start Centers	Observation
	Secondary Data Instrument	Determine program demographic character characteristics	Fifth Annual Survey	Transcribe data
	Non-Enrolled Child Interview Schedule	Describe handicapped children not enrolled in the programs	Parents	Telephone or personal interview
Child-Specific Data for Sample Handicapped Children	In-Depth Case Study Schedule	Describe services provided to the child	Program staff	Personal interview
	Facilities Walk-Through Checklist, Section B	Determine extent of social integration of child in the classroom	Child in classroom setting	Observation
	Service Provider Schedule	Describe characteristics of child's service providers and types of services provided	Service providers	Telephone or personal interview
	Written Record Review	Analyze child's diagnostic file	Diagnostic file	Questionnaire
Program-Specific Data on non-Head Start programs	Alternate Program Schedule	Determine program characteristics and services typically provided to handicapped children	Program Director	Personal interview
	Facilities Walk-Through Checklist, Section A	Describe program's facilities and equipment	Program building and classrooms	Observation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PHASE I

	Question	Page
Study Instrumentation - Exhibit 1.1		ii
Primary Data Interview Schedule - Form 01		1.1
Table 1.1	1	1.2
Table 1.2	1	1.3
Table 1.3	2	1.4
Table 1.4	3	1.5
Table 1.5	3	1.6
Table 1.6	4	1.7
Table 1.7	4a	1.8
Table 1.8	4a	1.9
Table 1.9	4b	1.10
Table 1.10	4c	1.11
Table 1.11	4d	1.12
Table 1.12	5	1.13
Table 1.13	5a	1.13
Table 1.14	5b	1.14
Table 1.15	6a	1.15
Table 1.16	6b	1.16
Table 1.17	7	1.17
Table 1.18	7	1.18
Table 1.19	8	1.19
Table 1.20	8	1.20
Table 1.21	8	1.21
Table 1.22	8	1.22
Table 1.23	9	1.23
Table 1.24	9	1.24
Table 1.25	9	1.25
Table 1.26	9a	1.26
Table 1.27	10	1.27
Table 1.28	11	1.28
Table 1.29	12	1.29

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Question	Page
Table 1.30	12	1.30
Table 1.31	12	1.31
Table 1.32	12	1.32
Table 1.33	12	1.33
Table 1.34	12	1.34
Table 1.35	12	1.35
Table 1.36	12	1.36
Table 1.37	12	1.37
Table 1.38	13	1.38
Table 1.39	13a	1.39
Table 1.40	14	1.40
PHASE I		
Secondary Data Instrument - Form 02		2.1
Table 2.1	1	2.2
Table 2.2	1a	2.3
Table 2.3	1b	2.4
Table 2.4	1c	2.5
Table 2.5	1d	2.6
Table 2.6	1e	2.7
Table 2.7	2	2.8
Table 2.8	3	2.9
Table 2.9	3	2.10
Table 2.10	3a	2.11
Table 2.11	4	2.12
Table 2.12	5	2.13
Table 2.13	6	2.14
Table 2.14	6	2.15
Table 2.15	7	2.16
Table 2.16	7	2.17
Table 2.17	8	2.18
Table 2.18	8	2.19

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Question	Page
Table 2.19	9	2.20
Table 2.20	11	2.21
Table 2.21	12	2.22
Table 2.21A	13	2.23
Table 2.22	14	2.24
Table 2.23	15	2.25
Table 2.24	16	2.26
Table 2.25	17	2.27
Table 2.26	17a	2.28
Table 2.27	17b	2.29
Table 2.28	17c	2.30
PHASE I -		
Facilities Walk Through Checklist - Section A - Form 03		3.1
Table 3.1	1	3.2
Table 3.2	2	3.3
Table 3.3	3	3.4
Table 3.4	4	3.5
Table 3.5	5	3.6
Table 3.6	6	3.7
In-Depth Child Case Study Schedule - Form 04		4.1
Table 4.1	1	4.2
Table 4.2	2	4.3
Table 4.3	3	4.4
Table 4.4	4, 4a	4.5
Table 4.5a	5, 5a	4.6
Table 4.5b	5b	4.7
Table 4.6	6	4.8
Table 4.7	7	4.9
Table 4.8	7a	4.10
Table 4.9	8	4.11
Table 4.10A	9	4.12
Table 4.10B	9a	4.12
Table 4.10C	9b	4.12

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Question	Page
Table 4.11	10,10a	4.13
Table 4.12	11	4.14
Table 4.13	11	4.15
Table 4.14	12	4.16
Table 4.15	13	4.17
Table 4.16	13a	4.18
Table 4.17	13b	4.19
Table 4.18	13b	4.20
Table 4.19	14	4.21
Table 4.20	14	4.22
Table 4.21	15	4.23
Table 4.22	15a	4.24
Table 4.23	15a	4.25
Table 4.24	15a	4.26
Table 4.25	15a	4.27
Table 4.26	16	4.28
Table 4.27	16	4.29
Table 4.28	16	4.30
Table 4.29	17	4.31
Table 4.30	18	4.32
Table 4.31	18	4.33
Table 4.32A	18	4.34
Table 4.32B	18	4.35
Table 4.33	18	4.36
Table 4.34	18	4.37
Table 4.35	18	4.38
Table 4.36	18	4.39
Table 4.37	18	4.40
Table 4.38	18	4.41
Table 4.39	19	4.42
Table 4.40	20	4.43
Table 4.41	21	4.44

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Question	Page
Table 4.42	21	4.45
Table 4.43	22	4.46
Table 4.44	22a	4.47
Table 4.45	23	4.48
Table 4.46	24	4.49
Table 4.47	25	4.50
Table 4.48	26	4.51
Table 4.49	26a	4.52
Table 4.50	26b	4.53
Table 4.51	27	4.54
Table 4.52	28	4.55
Table 4.53	29	4.56
Table 4.54	30	4.57
Table 4.55	31	4.58
Table 4.56	31a	4.59
Table 4.57	31a	4.60
Table 4.58	32	4.61
Table 4.59	32a	4.62
Table 4.60	32b	4.63
Table 4.61	33	4.64
Table 4.62	33a	4.65
Table 4.63	34	4.66
Table 4.64	34a	4.67
Table 4.65	34a	4.68
Table 4.66	34a	4.69
Table 4.67	35	4.70
Table 4.68	36	4.71
Table 4.69	37	4.72
Table 4.70	38	4.73
Table 4.71	39	4.74
Table 4.72	40	4.75
Table 4.73	40a	4.76

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Question	Page
PHASE I		
Diagnostician/Professional Service Provider Schedule - Part A: Individual's Characteristics - Form 07		7.1
Table 7.1	1	7.2
Table 7.2	2	7.3
Table 7.3	3	7.4
Table 7.4	3a	7.5
Table 7.5	3b	7.6
Part B: Child Specific Data - Form 08		8.1
Table 8.1	1	8.2
Table 8.2	2	8.3
Table 8.3	3	8.4
Table 8.4	4	8.5
Table 8.5	4	8.6
Table 8.6	4,5	8.7
Table 8.7	6	8.8
Table 8.8	7	8.9
Table 8.9	8	8.10
Table 8.10	8	8.11
Table 8.11	8	8.12
Table 8.12	8	8.13
Table 8.13	8	8.14
Table 8.14	8	8.15
Table 8.15	9	8.16
Table 8.16	10	8.17
Table 8.17	11	8.18
Table 8.18	12	8.19
Table 8.19	13	8.20
Table 8.20	14	8.21
Table 8.21	15	8.22
Table 8.22	16	8.23
Table 8.23	17	8.24

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Question	Page
Table 8.24	18	8.25
Table 8.25	19	8.26
Table 8.26	20	8.27
Table 8.27	21	8.28
PHASE I		
Non-Enrolled Child Interview Schedule - Form 09		9.1
Table 9.1	1	9.2
Table 9.2	1	9.3
Table 9.3	2	9.4
Table 9.4	2a	9.5
Table 9.5	5	9.5
Table 9.6	3	9.6
Table 9.7	4	9.6
Table 9.8	4	9.7
Table 9.9	5	9.7
Table 9.10	5	9.8
Alternate Program Schedule - Form 10		10.1
Table 10.1	1	10.2
Table 10.2	2	10.3
Table 10.3	3	10.4
Table 10.4	3a	10.5
Table 10.5	4	10.6
Table 10.6	4a	10.7
Table 10.7	5	10.8
Table 10.8	5a	10.9
Table 10.9	5b	10.10
Table 10.10	6	10.11
Table 10.11	6	10.12
Table 10.12	6a	10.13
Table 10.13	6b	10.14
Table 10.14	7	10.15

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Question	Page
Table 10.15	7b	10.16
Table 10.16	7c	10.17
Table 10.17	8	10.18
Table 10.18	9	10.19
Table 10.19	9a	10.20
Table 10.20	10	10.21
Table 10.21	11	10.22
Table 10.22	11	10.23
Table 10.23	11	10.24
Table 10.24	11	10.25
Table 10.25	11	10.26
Table 10.26	11	10.27
Table 10.27	11	10.28
Table 10.28	11	10.29
Table 10.29	11	10.30
Table 10.30	11	10.31
Table 10.31	12,12a	10.32
Table 10.32	13	10.33
Table 10.33	13	10.34
Table 10.34	13	10.35
Table 10.35	13	10.36
Table 10.36	13	10.37
Table 10.37	13	10.38
Table 10.38	13	10.39
Table 10.39	13	10.40
Table 10.40	14	10.41
Table 10.41	15	10.42
Table 10.42	16	10.43
Table 10.43	17	10.44
Table 10.44	18,18a,18b	10.45
Table 10.45	19	10.46
Table 10.46	20	10.47

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Question	Page
Table 10.47	21a	10.48
Table 10.48	21a	10.49
Table 10.49	22a	10.50
Table 10.50	23	10.51
Table 10.51	24a	10.52
Table 10.52	24b	10.53
Table 10.53	25	10.54
Table 10.54	26	10.55
Table 10.55	27	10.56
Table 10.56	28	10.57
Table 10.57	28a	10.58
Table 10.58	29	10.59
Table 10.59	29a	10.60
Table 10.60	30	10.61
Table 10.61	31	10.62

PHASE I

PRIMARY DATA INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Form 01

1.1

TABLE 1.1

PROGRAM HAS LIST OF HANDICAPPED
CHILDREN WAITING TO ENROLL

(Question 1)

Waiting List of Handicapped Children	% of Head Start Programs (n=59)
Yes	28.8 (n=17)
No	71.2 (n=42)

TABLE 1.2

(Question 1)

Distribution of Types of Handicapped Children Not Able to Enroll in Head Start	
Handicapping Condition	% of total
Blind	*
Visually Impaired	2.7 (N=6)
Deaf	0.5 (N=1)
Hearing Impaired	4.1 (N=9)
Physical Handicap	6.9 (N=15)
Speech Impaired	35.8 (N=86)
Health or Developmentally Impaired	15.8 (N=35)
Mentally Retarded	9.5 (N=21)
Serious Emotional Disturbance	18.1 (N=40)
Specific Learning Disability	3.6 (N=8)
Total**	100 (N=221)

TABLE 1.3

HOW VACANCIES ARE FILLED IF AN

OPENING BECOMES AVAILABLE

(Question 2)

How Vacancy is Filled	% of All Head Start Programs
Inappropriate, Not Relevant	3.4 (n=2)
Child is selected who has been on the waiting list longest, regardless of whether he/she is handicapped	8.5 (n=5)
We would tend to enroll a handicapped child	49.2 (n=29)
We would tend to enroll a non-handicapped child	0.0 (n=0)
It depends on the child who left the program	10.2 (n=6)
Other	28.8 (n=17)

TABLE 1.4

PROGRAM WOULD PREFER TO ENROLL
ONE TYPE OF HANDICAPPED CHILD OVER ANOTHER
(Question 3)

Prefer to Enroll One Type of Handicapped Child Over Another	% of All Head Start Programs (n=59)
Yes	13.6 (n=8)
No	86.4 (n=51)

TABLE 1.5

CHOICES OF HANDICAPPING CONDITION

(Question 3)

Choices of Handicap (Up to 4 choices Per Program)	% of All Head Start Programs (n=59)
Blindness	3.4 (n=2)
Visual Impairment	0.0 (n=0)
Deafness	1.6 (n=1)
Hearing Impairment	3.4 (n=2)
Physical Handicap	5.1 (n=3)
Speech Impairment	5.1 (n=3)
Health or Developmental Impairment	8.5 (n=5)
Mental Retardation	5.1 (n=3)
Serious Emotional Disturbance	3.4 (n=2)
Specific Learning Disability	5.1 (n=3)

TABLE 1.6

PROGRAM HAS REFERRED HANDICAPPED CHILDREN NOT ENROLLED IN HEAD START TO OTHER COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

(Question 4)

Program Has Referred Children	% of All Head Start Programs (n=59)
Yes	28.8 (n=17)
No	71.2 (n=42)

TABLE 1.7

(Question 4a)

Type of Handicapped Children Referred to Other Programs by Head Start	
Handicapping Condition	% of Total
Blind	2.1 (N=2)
Visually Impaired	2.1 (N=2)
Deaf	*
Hearing Impaired	11.5 (N=11)
Physical Handicap	8.3 (N=8)
Speech Impaired	25.0 (N=24)
Health or Developmentally Impaired	9.4 (N=9)
Mentally Retarded	12.5 (N=12)
Serious Emotional Disturbance	15.6 (N=15)
Specific Learning Disability	1.0 (N=1)
Other	12.5 (N=12)
Total**	100 (N=96)

TABLE 1.8

(Question 4a)

Type of Severely Handicapped Children Referred to Other Programs by Head Start	
Handicapping Condition	% of total
Blind	4.5 (N=2)
Visually Impaired	2.3 (N=1)
Deaf	*
Hearing Impaired	4.5 (N=2)
Physical Handicap	13.6 (N=6)
Speech Impaired	15.9 (N=7)
Health or Developmentally Impaired	9.1 (N=4)
Mentally Retarded	25.0 (N=11)
Serious Emotional Disturbance	22.7 (N=10)
Specific Learning Disability	2.3 (N=1)
Other	*
Total**	100 (N=44)

TABLE 1.9

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF CHILDREN REFERRED
TO PROGRAM OR SCREENED BY PROGRAM
AS POTENTIALLY HANDICAPPED DURING THIS PROGRAM YEAR

(Question 4b)

Number of Children Referred/Screened As potentially Handicapped	% of Head Start Programs
1-20	42.4 (n=25)
21-40	28.8 (n=17)
41-100	18.6 (n=11)
100-365	10.2 (n=6)

TABLE 1.10

(Question 4c)

Agencies To Which Non-Enrolled Children Were Referred	
Agency	% of Total[1/]
Public Schools	58.8 (N=10)
Easter Seals Program	29.4 (N=4)
Association for Crippled Children	29.4 (N=5)
Other Private Categorical Program	41.2 (N=7)
Other/Private Non-Categorical Program	17.6 (N=3)
State Institution	23.5 (N=4)
Other Head Start Program	41.2 (N=7)
Other	41.2 (N=7)

[1/] Percentages are based on a total of 17 Head Start programs that referred non-enrolled children to other agencies. Programs were allowed to indicate more than one agency.

TABLE 1.11

AGENCIES TO WHICH CHILDREN

ARE MOST OFTEN REFERRED

(Question 4 d)

Agency Referred To Most Often	% of Total[1/]
Public Schools	37.1 (n=13)
Easter Seal	8.8 (n=3)
Association for Crippled Children	2.9 (n-1)
BEH First Chance Project	0.0 (n=0)
University Affiliated Program	2.9 (n=1)
Other Private Categorical Program	8.8 (n=3)
Other/Private Non-Categorical Program	2.9 (n=1)
State Institution	2.9 (n=1)
Other Head Start Program	5.7 (n=2)
Other	28.6 (n=10)

[1/] Percentages are based on a total of 17 Head Start programs that referred non-enrolled children to other agencies. Programs are allowed to indicate more than one agency.

TABLE 1.12

(Question 5)

Head Start Programs That Competed With Other Agencies to Enroll a Particular Child	
Competition	% of Total
Yes	18.6 (N=11)
No, but the possibility for conflict exists	28.8 (N=17)
No	52.5 (N=31)
Total**	100 (N=59)

TABLE 1.13

(Question 5a)

Agencies With Whom Head Start Does or May Potentially Compete	
Agency	% of Total [1/]
Public Schools	71.4 (N=20)
Easter Seal	7.1 (N=2)
University Affiliated Program	3.6 (N=1)
Other Private Categorical Program	28.6 (N=8)
Other Private Non-Categorical Program	21.4 (N=6)
State Institution	7.1 (N=2)
Other Head Start Program	7.1 (N=2)
Other	17.8 (N=5)

[1/] Percentages are based on a total of 28 programs that indicated they had competed or may potentially compete with other agencies over enrollment of a specific handicapped child. Some programs indicated more than one agency.

TABLE 1.14

(Question 5b)

Reasons for Actual or Potential Conflict Over Enrollment	
Reason	% of Total [1]
Dispute Over Most Appropriate Placement for Services	46.4 (N=13)
Dispute Over Obtaining Children for Funding	25.0 (N=7)
Serve Same Geographic Area	75.0 (N=21)
Other	10.7 (N=3)

[1] Percentages are based on a total of 28 programs that indicated they had competed or may potentially compete with other agencies over enrollment of a specific handicapped child. Some programs indicated more than one reason.

TABLE 1.15

(Question 6a)

Conditions of Parent-Initiated Termination from Head Start Programs

Number of Children Terminated	Conditions of Termination					
	Moved % of Column	Parental Dissatisfaction With Program % of Column	Child No Longer Needed Program % of Column	Child Transferred to Another Program % of Column	Unknown % of Column	Total of Programs With Voluntary Withdrawals % of Column
Total**	100 (N=59)	100 (N=59)	100 (N=59)	100 (N=59)	100 (N=59)	100 (N=59)
1-5 Children	47.1 (N=28)	8.5 (N=5)	5.1 (N=3)	18.6 (N=11)	8.5 (N=5)	44.1 (N=26)
6-10 Children	1.7 (N=1)	*	1.7 (N=1)	1.7 (N=1)	*	5.1 (N=3)
Over 10 Children	3.4 (N=2)	*	*	1.7 (N=1)	*	3.4 (N=2)
None/no response	47.5 (N=28)	91.5 (N=54)	93.2 (N=55)	78.0 (N=46)	91.5 (N=54)	47.5 (N=28)

1.15

TABLE 1.16

(Question 6b)

Conditions of Center-Initiated Termination from Head Start Programs

Number of Children Terminated	Conditions of Termination					
	Classroom Management Difficulties % of Column	Age Ineligible % of Column	Entrance into Public School-Special Class % of Column	Inability of Staff to Deal With Handicap % of Column	Entrance into Other Service Program % of Column	Total of Programs With Center Terminations % of Column
Total **	100 (N=59)	100 (N=59)	100 (N=59)	100 (N=59)	100 (N=59)	100 (N=59)
1-5 Children	1.7 (N=1)	8.5 (N=5)	13.6 (N=8)	5.1 (N=3)	16.9 (N-10)	15.3 (N=9)
6-10 Children	*	*	5.1 (N=3)	*	1.7 (N=1)	3.4 (N=2)
Over 10 Children	*	1.7 (N=1)	11.9 (N=7)	*	*	5.1 (N=3)
None/no response	98.3 (N=58)	89.8 (N=53)	69.7 (N=41)	94.9 (N=56)	81.4 (N=48)	76.3 (N=45)

TABLE 1.17

PROVISIONS ARE MADE TO PROVIDE CONTINUITY OF SERVICES FOR DISCONTINUED HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

(Question 7)

Continuity Provided for Discontinued Handicapped Children	% of Total (n=59)
Yes	76.3 (n=45)
No	20.3 (n=12)
Not Indicated	3.4 (n=2)

TABLE 1.18

PROVISIONS FOR CONTINUITY OF

SERVICES ARE MADE FOR BOTH VOLUNTARY AND CENTER TERMINATIONS

(Question 7)

Continuity Provided for Voluntary and Center Terminations	% of All (n=45) 1/
Yes	93.3 (n=42)
No	4.4 (n=2)
Not Indicated	2.2 (n=1)

1/ Percentages are based on the 45 programs indicating they made provisions for continuity of services to discontinued handicapped children.

TABLE 1.19

NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN PROGRAM WHO
ARE HANDICAPPED AND ABOVE OCD INCOME GUIDELINES

(Question 8)

Enrollment	% of Head Start Programs (n=59)
None	25.4 (n=15)
1-5	42.4 (n=25)
6-10	25.4 (n=15)
11-20	5.1 (n=3)
67	1.69 (n=1)

TABLE 1.20

NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN PROGRAM WHO ARE

HANDICAPPED AND WITHIN OCD INCOME GUIDELINES

(Question 8)

Enrollment	% of Head Start Programs (n=59)
1-20	40.7 (n=24)
21-40	28.8 (n=17)
41-100	22.0 (n=13)
Over 100	8.5 (n=5)

TABLE 1.21

NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN PROGRAM WHO ARE
NON-HANDICAPPED AND ABOVE OCD INCOME GUIDELINES

(Question 8)

Enrollment	% of Head Start Programs (n=59)
None	16.9 (n=10)
1-10	44.1 (n=26)
11-20	6.8 (n=4)
21-50	23.7 (n=14)
Over 50	8.5 (n=5)

TABLE 1.22

NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN PROGRAM WHO
ARE NON-HANDICAPPED AND WITHIN OCD INCOME GUIDELINES

(Question 8)

Enrollment	% of Head Start Programs (n=59)
Up to 200	59.3 (n=35)
201-400	16.9 (n=10)
401-600	8.5 (n=5)
601-800	8.5 (n=5)
801-1000	6.8 (n=4)

TABLE 1.23

NUMBER OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
THREE YEARS OF AGE SERVED BY PROGRAM

(Question 9)

Enrollment	% of Head Start Programs (n=59)
0-10	84.7 (n=50)
11-20	5.1 (n=3)
21-50	8.5 (n=5)
51-100	1.7 (n=1)
Over 100	0.0 (n=0)

TABLE 1.24

NUMBER OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
FOUR YEARS OF AGE SERVED BY PROGRAM

(Question 9)

Enrollment	% of Head Start Programs (n=59)
0-10	35.6 (n=21)
11-20	33.9 (n=20)
21-50	16.9 (n-10)
51-100	8.5 (n=5)
Over 100	5.1 (n=3)

TABLE 1.25

NUMBER OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
FIVE YEARS OF AGE SERVED BY PROGRAM

(Question 9)

Enrollment	% of Head Start Programs (n=59)
0-10	55.9 (n=33)
11-20	11.9 (n=7)
21-50	30.5 (n=18)
51-100	0.0 (n=0)
Over 100	1.7 (n=1)

TABLE 1.26

PROGRAMS REPORTING SERVICES TO
HANDICAPPED CHILDREN WHO HAVE BEEN OR WILL BE
ENROLLED IN HEAD HEAD TWO OR MORE YEARS

(Question 9a)

RANGES OF CHILDREN SERVED TWO OR MORE YEARS	% of Head Start Programs per Enrollment Range
None	15.3 (n=9)
1-20	66.1 (n=39)
21-40	11.9 (n=7)
41-100	5.1 (n=3)
Over 100	1.7 (n=1)

TABLE 1.27

NUMBER OF YEARS PROGRAM HAS BEEN
PROVIDING SERVICES TO HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

(Question 10)

Number of Years	% of Head Start Programs (n=59)
Up to One Year	5.1 (n=3)
Two Years	15.3 (n=9)
Three Years	16.9 (n=10)
Four Years	6.8 (n=4)
Five Years	3.4 (n=2)
More Than Five Years	52.5 (n=31)

TABLE 1.28

TOTAL FUNDING OF PROGRAM
FOR FISCAL YEAR 1977

(Question 11)

Total Funding	% of Head Start Programs (n=59)
Less than-100,000	5.1 (n=3)
$100,000-300,000	37.2 (n=22)
$300,001-600,000	27.1 (n=16)
$600,001-1,000,000	18.6 (n=11)
Over $1,000,000	11.9 (n=7)

TABLE 1.29

SOURCE OF FUNDS USED TO SERVE HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

(Question 12)

Source of Funds	% of Programs[1/] (n=59)
Basic Head Start Grant	30.5 (n=18)
Head Start Supplemental Funds	79.7 (n=47)
BEH First Chance Funds	0.0 (n=0)
State "Reimbursement of Services" Funds	3.4 (n=2)
Other State Funds	0.0 (n=0)
Other Local Funds	3.4 (n=2)
Other Federal Funds	5.1 (n=3)
Other Education for the Handicapped Funds	1.7 (n=1)
Other	6.8 (n=4)

[1/] Programs could indicate more than one source of funds.

TABLE 1.30

BASIC HEAD START GRANT FUNDS FOR SERVICES
TO THE HANDICAPPED

(Question 12)

Funds	% of Programs (n=59)
$1 - 9,999	6.8 (n=4)
$10,000 - 19,999	5.1 (n=3)
$20,000 - 39,000	6.8 (n=4)
$40,000 - 100,000	3.4 (n=2)
Over $100,000	8.5 (n=5)
None/not reported	69.5 (n=41)

TABLE 1.31

HEAD START SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS FOR SERVICES
TO THE HANDICAPPED

(Question 12)

Funds	% of Programs (n=59)
$1 - 9,999	25.4 (n=15)
$10,000 - 19,999	22.0 (n=13)
$20,000 - 39,000	11.9 (n=7)
$40,000 - 100,000	16.9 (n=10)
Over $100,000	3.4 (n=2)
None/not reported	20.3 (n-12)

TABLE 1.32

STATE "REIMBURSEMENT OF SERVICES" FUNDS FOR SERVICES TO THE HANDICAPPED

(Question 12)

Funds	% of Programs (n=59)
$1 - 9,999	0.0 (n= 0)
$10,000-19,999	1.7 (n= 1)
$20,000-39,000	0.0 (n= 0)
$40,000-100,000	1.7 (n= 1)
Over $100,000	0.0 (n= 0)
None/not reported	96.6 (n=57)

TABLE 1.33

OTHER LOCAL FUNDS FOR SERVICES
TO THE HANDICAPPED

(Question 12)

Funds	% of Programs (n=59)
$1 - 9,999	1.7 (n= 1)
$10,000-19,999	0.0 (n= 0)
$20,000-39,000	0.0 (n= 0)
$40,000-100,000	1.7 (n= 1)
Over $100,000	0.0 (n= 0)
None/not reported	96.6 (n=57)

TABLE 1.34

OTHER FEDERAL FUNDS FOR SERVICES
TO THE HANDICAPPED

(Question 12)

Funds	% of Programs (n=59)
$1 - 9,999	1.7 (n= 1)
$10,000-19,999	1.7 (n= 1)
$20,000-39,000	0.0 (n= 0)
$40,000-100,000	1.7 (n= 1)
Over $100,000	0.0 (n= 0)
None/not reported	95.0 (n-56)

TABLE 1.35

OTHER EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED FUNDS

(Question 12)

Funds	% of Programs (n=59)
$1 - 9,999	0.0 (n= 0)
$10,000-19,999	1.7 (n= 1)
$20,000-39,000	0.0 (n= 0)
$40,000-100,000	0.0 (n= 0)
Over $100,000	0.0 (n= 0)
None/not reported	98.3 (n-58)

TABLE 1.36

OTHER FUNDS FOR SERVICES
TO THE HANDICAPPED

(Question 12)

Funds	% of Programs (n=59)
$1 - 9,999	5.1 (n= 3)
$10,000-19,999	1.7 (n= 1)
$20,000-39,000	0.0 (n= 0)
$40,000-100,000	0.0 (n= 0)
Over $100,000	0.0 (n= 0)
None/not reported	93.2 (n=55)

TABLE 1.37

NUMBER OF YEARS FUNDS APPLIED TO HANDICAPPED SERVICES HAVE BEEN RECEIVED BY PROGRAMS

(Question 12)

Source of Funds	Years Funds Received					
	% of Programs Up to 2 Years	% of Programs 3-4 Years	% of Programs 5-6 Years	% of Programs 7-8 Years	% of Programs 9-10 Years	% of Programs Over 10 Years
Basic Head Start Grant	15.3 (n=9)	5.1 (n=3)	3.4 (n=2)	**	1.7 (n=1)	3.4 (n=2)
Head Start Supplemental Funds	50.1 (n=30)	16.9 (n=10)	6.8 (n=4)	**	**	**
BEH First Chance Funds	**	**	**	**	**	**
State "Reimbursement of Services" Funds	**	1.7 (n=1)	1.7 (n=1)	**	**	**
Other State Funds	**	**	**	**	**	**
Other Local Funds	1.7 (n=1)	**	**	**	**	**
Other Federal Funds	3.4 (n=2)	1.7 (n=1)	**	**	**	**
Other Education for the Handicapped Funds	1.7 (n=1)	**	**	**	**	**
Other	3.4 (n=2)	1.7 (n=1)	**	**	**	1.7 (n=1)

TABLE 1.38

IN-KIND SERVICES FOR
HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

(Question 13)

Program Receives In-Kind Services for Handicapped	% of All Programs (n=59)
Yes	96.6 (n=57)
No	3.4 (n=2)

TABLE 1.39

VALUE OF IN-KIND SERVICES
RECEIVED BY PROGRAM FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

(Question 13a)

Values of In-Kind Services	% of All Programs (n=59)
Up to $10,000	20.3 (n=12)
$10,000 - 20,000	25.4 (n=15)
$20,001 - 40,000	11.9 (n=7)
$40,001 - 100,000	18.6 (n=11)
$100,001 - 500,000	18.6 (n-11)
$500,001 - 1,000,000	1.7 (n-1)

TABLE 1.40

(Question 14)

Entrance Requirements for Head Start Enrollment of Handicapped Children	
Requirement	% of Total [1]
Chronological Age	96.6 (N=57)
Certain Handicapping Condition(s)	15.3 (N=9)
Certain Severity Level	22.0 (N=13)
Ambulatory	15.3 (N=9)
Toilet Trained	13.6 (N=8)
Functioning at Minimum Developmental Level	15.3 (N=9)
Parental Commitment to Participate in Program	13.6 (N=8)
Must Meet Income Guidelines	44.1 (N=26)
Other	23.7 (N=14)

[1] Percentages are based on a total of 59 programs. Programs could indicate more than one requirement.

PHASE I

SECONDARY DATA INSTRUMENT

FORM 02

2.1

TABLE 2.1

TOTAL NUMBER OF HEADSTART
CENTERS IN CURRENT PROGRAM

(Question 1)

Number of Centers	% of Programs (n=56) 1/
1-3	26.8 (n=15)
4-6	26.8 (n=15)
7-9	8.9 (n=5)
10-20	28.6 (n=16)
Over 20	8.9 (n=5)

1/ Based on the 56 programs in the study which had completed the Annual Survey.

TABLE 2.2

TOTAL PROGRAM ENROLLMENT

(Question 1a)

Enrollment	% of Programs (n=56)
30-100	19.6 (n=11)
101-200	32.1 (n=18)
201-300	10.7 (n=6)
301-500	10.7 (n=6)
501-700	10.7 (n=6)
701-1000	8.9 (n=5)
Over 1000	7.1 (n=4)

TABLE 2.3

NUMBER OF CENTERS WITH
AT LEAST ONE HANDICAPPED CHILD

(Question 1b)

Number of Centers	% of Program (n=56)
1-3	28.6 (n=16)
4-6	28.6 (n=16)
7-9	5.4 (n=3)
10-12	21.4 (n=12)
13-15	5.4 (n=3)
Over 15	10.7 (n=6)

TABLE 2.4

TOTAL NUMBER OF CLASSES
IN PROGRAM

(Question 1c)

Number of Classes	% of Program (n=56)
Up to 10	44.6 (n=25)
11-20	23.2 (n=13)
21-30	14.3 (n=8)
31-40	5.4 (n=3)
41-50	7.1 (n=4)
Over 50	5.4 (n=3)

TABLE 2.5

TOTAL NUMBER OF CLASSES
IN PROGRAM WITH AT LEAST ONE HANDICAPPED CHILD

(Question 1d)

Number of Classes	% of Programs (n=56)
Up to 10	44.6 (n=25)
11-20	28.6 (n=16)
21-30	16.1 (n=9)
31-40	3.6 (n=2)
41-50	1.8 (n=1)
Over 50	5.4 (n=3)

TABLE 2.6

RATIO OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
TO NON-HANDICAPPED CHILDREN*

(Question 1e)

Ratio	% of Programs (n=56)
Up to .10	41.1 (n=23)
.11-.20	39.3 (n=22)
.21-.30	10.7 (n=6)
.31-.40	1.8 (n=1)
.41-.50	1.8 (n=1)
Over .50	5.4 (n=3)

*Ratio = $\frac{\text{Total Handicapped}}{\text{Total Non-Handicapped}}$

TABLE 2.7

PROGRAM HAS SPECIAL PROCEDURES, ACTIVITIES AND RESOURCES FOR IDENTIFYING PRESCHOOL HANDICAPPED

(Question 2)

Program has Special Procedures, Activities and Resources for Identifying Preschool Handicapped	% of Programs (n=56)
Yes	94.6 (n=53)
No	5.4 (n=3)

TABLE 2.8

THERE ARE SOME HANDICAPPED CHILDREN WHO WERE NOT ABLE TO ENROLL IN THE PROGRAM

(Question 3)

Some Children Not Enrolled	% of Programs (n=56)
No... All Handicapped Children Who Were Located or Referred Were Enrolled	64.3 (n=36)
Yes...Some Handicapped Children were Not Enrolled	35.7 (n=20)

TABLE 2.9

NUMBER OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
NOT ABLE TO ENROLL

(Question 3)

Handicapped Children Unable to Enroll	% of Programs (n=56)
All Handicapped Children Enrolled	64.3 (n=36)
1	3.6 (n=2)
2	8.9 (n=5)
3	8.9 (n=5)
5	1.8 (n=1)
6	5.4 (n=3)
10	1.8 (n=1)
15	1.8 (n=1)
24	1.8 (n=1)
59	1.8 (n=1)

TABLE 2.10

REASONS SOME HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
WERE UNABLE TO ENROLL IN PROGRAM

(Question 3a)

Reason	% of Programs (n=56)
Did not meet income guidelines	16.1 (n=9)
No available openings	19.6 (n=11)
Lack of appropriate staff training	**
Lack of suitable facilities or equipment	1.8 (n=1)
Other agencies serve these children	10.7 (n=6)
Concern over possible legal liabilities	**
Classroom management problems	**
Handicap too severe for child to benefit from Head Start	7.4 (n=4)
Felt child's attendance would be detrimental to other children	1.8 (n=1)
Child's parent refused	14.3 (n=8)
Other parents or parent advisory group objected	**
Lack of adequate transportation	12.5 (n=7)
Other	16.1 (n=9)

TABLE 2.11

PROFESSIONALLY DIAGNOSED HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
BY PRIMARY HANDICAP

(Question 4)

Primary Handicapping Condition	Distribution of Children %
Blindness	3.2 (n=97)
Visual Impairment	3.8 (n=115)
Deafness	0.2 (n=7)
Hearing Impairment	4.0 (n=120)
Physical Handicap	6.0 (n=178)
Speech Impairment	50.3 (n=1,503)
Health or Developmental Impairment	15.0 (n=448)
Mental Retardation	6.7 (n=199)
Serious Emotional Disturbance	7.5 (n=224)
Specific Learning Disabilities	3.3 (n=100)
Total	100 (n=2,911)

TABLE 2.12

PROGRAM STAFF MEMBERS FUNCTIONING FOR THE PRIMARY OR EXCLUSIVE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

(Question 5)

Staff	Mean Number Per Program 1/
Full Time Teaching Staff	0.2 (n=12)
Part Time Teaching Staff	0.3 (n=15)
Full Time Specialist Staff	0.4 (n=20)
Part Time Specialist Staff	1.1 (n=63)
Volunteers	5.5 (n=310)
None	2 programs

1/ Based on 56 programs completing Annual Survey.

TABLE 2.13

OUTSIDE AGENCY PROVIDES ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR THE PRIMARY OR EXCLUSIVE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

(Question 6)

Outside Agency Staff Provided	% of Programs (n=56)
Yes	39.3 (n=22)
No	57.1 (n=32)
Not Indicated	3.6 (n=2)

TABLE 2.14

NUMBER OF OUTSIDE AGENCY
STAFF SERVING HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

(Question 6)

Staff Provided	% of Programs (n=56)
None	60.7 (n=34)
1	17.9 (n=10)
2	5.4 (n=3)
3	7.1 (n=4)
4	1.8 (n=1)
7	1.8 (n=1)
10	1.8 (n=1)
11	1.8 (n=1)
18	1.8 (n=1)

TABLE 2.15

PROGRAM HAS STAFF MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR
COORDINATING SERVICES FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

(Question 7)

Program has Handicap Coordinator	% of Programs (n=56)
Yes	91.1 (n=51)
No	8.9 (n=5)

TABLE 2.16

HANDICAP COORDINATOR IS
FULL TIME POSITION

(Question 7)

Full Time Position or Part Time	% of Programs (n=56)
Full-Time	51.8 (n=29)
Part-Time	33.9 (n=19)
Not Indicated	14.3 (n=8)

TABLE 2.17

PRESERVICE TRAINING ABOUT HANDICAPPED CHILDREN HAS BEEN PROVIDED TO STAFF

(Question 8)

Preservice Training Provided	% of Program (n=56)
Yes	87.5 (n=49)
No	12.5 (n=7)

TABLE 2.18

NUMBER OF STAFF MEMBERS PARTICIPATING

IN PRESERVICE TRAINING

(Question 8)

Number of Staff in Preservice Training	% of Programs (N=49) [1]
Up to 10	16.3 (N=8)
11 to 20	16.3 (N=8)
21-30	10.2 (N=5)
31-40	12.2 (N=6)
41-50	12.2 (N=6)
51-60	10.2 (N=5)
Over 60	22.4 (N=11)

[1] Number of programs with staff receiving pre-service training.

TABLE 2.19

AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS OF
PRE-SERVICE TRAINING PER STAFF MEMBER

(Question 9)

Average Number of Hours Per Staff Member	% of Programs (N=49) 1/
Up to 10	61.2 (N=30)
11-20	22.4 (N=11)
21-30	12.2 (N=6)
Over 30	4.1 (N=2)

1/ Number of programs with staff participating in pre-service training.

(Question 10)

Data is not available.

TABLE 2.20

IN SERVICE TRAINING HAS BEEN PROVIDED
ABOUT HANDICAPPED CHILDREN FOR PROGRAM STAFF

(Question 11)

Inservice Training Provided for Staff	% of Programs (n=56)
No, there was no training provided or being provided	96.4 (n=54)
Yes, training has been or is being provided	3.6 (n=2)

TABLE 2.21

NUMBER OF STAFF MEMBERS RECEIVING INSERVICE TRAINING

(Question 12)

Number of Staff Receiving Inservice Training	% of Programs (N=54) [1]
Up to 10	16.7 (N=9)
11 to 20	18.5 (N=10)
21 to 30	16.7 (N=9)
31 to 40	9.2 (N=5)
41 to 50	13.0 (N=7)
51 to 60	5.6 (N=3)
Over 60	20.4 (N=11)

[1] Number of programs with staff receiving inservice training.

TABLE 2.21 A

AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS
OF INSERVICE TRAINING PER STAFF MEMBER

(Question 13)

Average Number of Hours Per Staff Member	% of Programs (N=54) [1]
Up to 10	48.1 (N=26)
11 to 20	14.8 (N=8)
21 to 30	14.8 (N=8)
31 to 40	7.4 (N=4)
41 to 75	9.3 (N=5)
Not Indicated	5.6 (N=3)

[1] Number of programs with staff receiving inservice training.

TABLE 2.22

SUBJECTS COVERED IN INSERVICE TRAINING

(Question 14)

Subject Areas	% of Programs Providing Training (n=59)
Child Development	76 (n=45)
Recognition of handicapping conditions	66 (n=39)
Techniques of screening, diagnosis and assessment	64 (n=38)
Special education and curricula for handicapped children	66 (n=39)
Integration, "mainstreaming" of handicapped children in the classroom	59 (n=35)
Physical therapy for handicapped children	20 (n=12)
Psychological problems of handicapped children	61 (n=36)
The health and medical needs of handicapped children	39 (n=23)
Working with the parents and families of handicapped children	59 (n=35)
Attitudes and sensitivity of persons working with handicapped children	44 (n=26)
Finding and Obtaining the special resources/services needed by handicapped children	51 (n=30)
Specialized, in-depth training for the purpose of recognizing, understanding, and dealing with specific disabilities:	63 (n=37)
• blindness, visual impairment	15 (n=9)
• deafness, hearing impairment	25 (n=15)
• speech impairment (communication disorder)	59 (n=35)
• Physical handicap	27 (n=16)
• Health or developmental impairment	19 (n=11)
• serious emotional disturbance	32 (n=19)
• mental retardation	27 (n=16)
• specific learning disabilities	37 (n=22)
Other training	17 (n=10)

TABLE 2.23

PROGRAM HAS RECEIVED TECHNICAL
ASSISTANCE FROM OTHER AGENCIES TO DETERMINE
NEED FOR OR PLAN FOR TRAINING OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

(Question 15)

Received Technical Assistance	% of Programs (n=56)
No... and none is/was needed	23.2 (n=13)
No...but some technical assistance would be or would have been helpful	21.4 (n=12)
Yes...and additional technical assistance would be or would have been helpful	16.1 (n=9)
Yes...and it was sufficient	39.3 (n=22)
if yes...what agency/organization provided the technical assistance? (Check all that apply)	% of Programs (n=31) 1/ 2/
• HEW/OCD Contractors (including STO's universities and colleges uder contract to OCD)	16.1 (n=5)
• HEW/BEH funded training institutions	3.2 (n=1)
• Other universities and colleges	19.4 (n=6)
• Special purpose agencies (Crippled Children Services, Cerebral Palsy Foundation, Association for Retarded Children, etc.)	29.0 (n=9)
• Other	32.3 (n=10)

1/ Number of programs which received technical assistance.

2/ Programs could indicate more than one option.

TABLE 2.24

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN PROGRAM
REQUIRE MODIFICATIONS OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

(Question 16)

Modifications Required	% of Programs (n=56)
No...no special modifications in physical facilities are required	76.8 (n=43)
Yes...special modifications in physical facilities were required and have already been made	5.4 (n=3)
Yes...special modification in physical facilities are required and are scheduled to be made before the end of the current Program	1.8 (n=1)
Yes...special modifications in physical facilities are required but there are no definite plans to make any	8.9 (n=5)
Not Indicated	7.1 (n=4)

TABLE 2.25

SPECIAL MATERIALS OR EQUIPMENT

FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN HAVE BEEN OR ARE BEING ACQUIRED

(Question 17)

Material or Equipment Acquired	% of Programs (n=56)
No	19.6 (n=11)
Yes	80.4 (n=45)
Special transportation equipment	15.5 (n=7) 1/ 2/
Special chairs, beds, wheelchairs, or other furniture	33.3 (n=15)
Special toys or equipment to develop fine or gross motor skills	82.2 (n=37)
Special audiovisual aids for the handicapped	31.1 (n=14)
Special books, charts or other instructional materials	66.0 (n=30)
Special language/speech development materials	64.4 (n=29)
Special instructional materials for parents of handicapped children	44.4 (n=20)
Special materials and references for staff development	77.8 (n=35)
Other	20.0 (n=9)

1/ Percentages based on 45 programs reporting that special materials or equipment for handicapped children have been or are being acquired.

2/ Programs could indicate more than one option.

TABLE 2.26

ESTIMATE OF TOTAL COST OF SPECIAL EQUIPMENT OR MATERIALS ACQUIRED FOR CURRENT PROGRAM
(Question 17a)

Source of Funds	% of Programs (n=56)						
	None Indicated	Up to $300	$301-500	$501-1,000	$1,001-5,000	$5,001-10,000	Over $10,000
Amount (to be) paid from Basic Head Start Grant	80.4 (n=45)	10.7 (n=6)	**	**	7.1 (n=4)	1.8 (n=1)	**
Amount (to be) paid from Head Start funds earmarked for services to handicapped children (PA 26)	30.4 (n=17)	12.5 (n=7)	10.7 (n=6)	10.7 (n=6)	23.2 (n=13)	7.1 (n=4)	5.3 (n=3)
Amount (to be) paid from other sources	89.3 (n=50)	3.6 (n=2)	1.8 (n=1)	3.5 (n=2)	1.8 (n=1)	**	**

TABLE 2.27

OTHER SPECIAL EQUIPMENT OR
MATERIALS NEEDED BY PROGRAM

(Question 17b)

Material Needed	% of Programs (n=56)	
None	33.9 (n=19)	
Yes	64.3 (n=36)	
↓		
Special transportation equipment		16.7 (n=6) 1/ 2/
Special chairs, beds, wheelchairs, or other furniture		11.1 (n=4)
Special toys or equipment to develop fine or gross motor skills		50.0 (n=18)
Special audiovisual aids for the handicapped		47.2 (n=17)
Special books, charts or other instructional materials		58.3 (n=21)
Special language/speech development materials		55.6 (n=20)
Special instructional materials for parents of handicapped children		63.9 (n=23)
Special materials and references for staff development		63.9 (n=23)
Other		16.7 (n=6)

1/ Percentages based on 36 programs indicating need for other special equipment or materials.

2/ Programs could indicate more than one option.

TABLE 2.28

REASONS SPECIAL EQUIPMENT
OR MATERIALS ARE NEEDED

(Question 17c)

Reason for Need	% of Programs (n=56)
Child with special needs recruited for the following year	8.9 (n=5)
Diagnosis on child with special needs recently completed indicating need for special equipment or materials	30.4 (n=17)
Other	26.8 (n=15)

PHASE I

FACILITIES WALK THROUGH
CHECKLIST - SECTION A

Form 03

TABLE 3.1

ESTIMATED SQUARE FOOTAGE OF CHILD'S CLASSROOM

(Question 1)

Square Footage	% of Classrooms[1]	
	Head Start	Non-Head Start
Up to 500	40.0 (n=58)	25.0 (n=11)
501-1000	45.5 (n=66)	43.2 (n=19)
1001-2000	6.8 (n=10)	20.4 (n=9)
2001-3000	4.1 (n=6)	4.5 (n=2)
Over 3000	2.8 (n=4)	2.2 (n=1)
Not Indicated	.7 (n=1)	4.5 (n=2)

[1] Head Start percentages are based on a total of 145 classrooms in which the sample children were placed. This figure is smaller than the number of children (N=269) since, in most cases, the same classroom contained more than one sample child. Non-Head Start percentages are based on typical classrooms in 44 programs.

TABLE 3.2

Question #2

Structural Facilities in Program Classrooms

Facility	% of Classes with Facilities[1]	
	Head Start	Non-Head Start
Ramps	6.9 (N=10)	27.3 (N=12)
Doors to building can be pushed open by children	53.8 (N=78)	52.3 (N=23)
Doors to classroom can be pushed open by children	62.1 (N=90)	61.4 (N=27)
Doors to bathroom facilities can be pushed open by children	60.7 (N=88)	59.1 (N=26)
Wall-to-wall carpet in classroom	13.8 (N=20)	47.7 (N=21)
Large area rug in classroom	54.5 (N=79)	50.0 (N=22)
Mats or throw rugs for resting and nap time	65.5 (N=95)	59.1 (N=26)
Bathroom in an easily accessible location	71.0 (N=103)	86.4 (N=38)
Bathroom facilities are easily usable by handicapped and non-handicapped children	57.2 (N=83)	81.8 (N=36)
Sink is in an easily accessible location in the classroom	37.2 (N=54)	63.6 (N=28)
Sink is easily usable by handicapped and non-handicapped children	49.6 (N=72)	65.9 (N=29)
Play area inside	89.0 (N=129)	93.2 (N=41)
Play area outside	89.6 (N=130)	88.6 (N=39)
Child size furniture and equipment (tables, shelves, etc.)	99.3 (N=144)	97.7 (N=43)
Room dividers	61.4 (N=89)	63.6 (N=28)
Lockers or special area for hanging coats, hats, rubbers and putting extra change of clothes	79.3 (N=115)	79.5 (N=35)
Low open shelves for general storage and display of small toys and blocks	95.2 (N=138)	84.1 (N=37)
High shelves or closed cabinets for teachers use	79.3 (N=115)	90.9 (N=40)
Teacher's desk	53.1 (N=77)	68.2 (N=30)
First aid equipment	71.7 (N=104)	65.9 (N=29)
Open space for activities like block play, art and music	94.5 (N=137)	88.6 (N=39)
House play and dramatic play areas	86.2 (N=125)	68.2 (N=30)

[1] Head Start percentages are based on a total of 145 classrooms in which the sample children were placed. This figure is smaller than the number of children (N=269) since, in most cases, the same classroom contained more than one sample child. Non-Head Start percentages are based on typical classrooms in 44 programs.

TABLE 3.3

GENERAL CONDITION OF
CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

(Question 3)

Condition	% of Classrooms (n=189) 1/	
	Head Start	Non-Head Start
Excellent (clean; no odors; attractive displays; well lighted; etc.).	62.8 (N=91)	72.7 (N=32)
Good (no odors or visible filth, but lacks attractive interior; adequately lighted).	30.3 (N=44)	27.3 (N=12)
Fair (no or poorly developed displays; odors, but no visible filth; poorly to fairly lighted).	5.5 (N=8)	*
Poor (visible filth; dark)	*	*
Total 1/	100.0 (N=143)	100.0 (N=44)

1/ Sample Head Start children (N=269) were placed in a total of 145 classrooms. Data were unavailable for two classrooms. Head Start percentages are, therefore, based on 143 classrooms. Non-Head Start percentages are based on typical classrooms in 44 programs.

TABLE 3.4

(Question 4)

General Equipment in Program's Classrooms		
Equipment	% of Total[1/]	
	Head Start	Non-Head Start
Materials for gross motor development (balls, outdoor play equipment)	91.7 (N=133)	95.4 (N=42)
Materials for fine motor development (crayons, cars, blocks, modeling clay)	95.9 (N=139)	95.4 (N=42)
Self helf materials (dolls, clothes, house play materials	91.0 (N=132)	88.6 (N=39)
Visual materials (books, etc.)	97.2 (N=141)	93.2 (N=41)

[1/] Head Start percentages are based on a total of 145 classrooms in which the sample children were placed. This figure is smaller than the numer of children (N=269) since in most cases, the same classroom contained more than one sample child. Non-Head Start percentages arebased on typical classrooms in 44 programs.

TABLE 3.5
(Question 5)

Availability of Special Equipment for Severely Handicapped Children in Program's Classrooms		
Equipment	% of Total[1/]	
	Head Start	Non-Head Start
Special chairs, beds, wheelchairs, or other furniture	9.6 (N=14)	59.1 (N=26)
Special toys or equipment to develop fine or gross motor skills	24.1 (N=35)	56.8 (N=25)
Special audiovisual aids for the handicapped	14.5 (N=21)	68.2 (N=30)
Special books, charts, or other instructional materials	18.6 (N=27)	65.9 (N=29)
Special Instructional materials for parents of handicapped children	17.2 (N=25)	47.7 (N=21)
Other	6.9 (N=10)	20.4 (N=9)

[1/] Head Start percentages are based on a total of 145 classrooms in which the sample children were placed. This figure is smaller than the number of children (N=269) since, in most cases, the same classroom contained more than one sample child. Non-Head Start percentages are based on typical classrooms in 44 programs.

TABLE 3.6

ROOMS OTHER THAN CLASSROOM USED FOR IMPLEMENTING EDUCATION CURRICULUM

(Question 6)

Other Rooms Used	% of Classrooms [1]	
	Head Start	Non-Head Start
Yes	46.2 (n=67)	61.4 (n=27)
No	53.1 (n=77)	22.7 (n=10)
Not Specified	6.8 (n=1)	15.9 (n=7)

[1] Head Start percentages are based on a total of 145 classrooms in which the sample children were placed. This figure is smaller than the number of children (N=269) since, in most cases, the same classrooms contained more than one sample child. Non-Head Start percentages are based on typical classrooms in 44 programs. In this particular table, the "other classrooms" considered are matched one-to-one with the classrooms observed. For example, Head Start children served in 67 of the classrooms visited also received instructional services in rooms other than the classrooms in question.

PHASE I

IN-DEPTH CHILD CASE STUDY SCHEDULE

Form 04

TABLE 4.1

(Question 1)

Distribution of Head Start Children According to Handicapping Conditions[1]	
Primary Handicapping Condition	% of Total
Visually Impaired	5.6 (N=15)
Blind	2.2 (N=6)
Hearing Impaired	7.8 (N=21)
Deaf	0.7 (N=2)
Physical Handicap	13.8 (N=37)
Speech Impaired	21.9 (N=59)
Health or Developmentally Impaired	11.2 (N=30)
Mentally Retarded	13.0 (N=35)
Specific Learning Disability	11.5 (N=31)
Serious Emotional Disturbance	12.3 (N=33)
Total**	100 (N=269)

[1] These data are specific to the Phase I study and do not reflect the actual distribution of the types of handicaps served by Head Start nationally.

TABLE 4.2

(Question 2)

Distribution of Head Start Children According to Severity Level of Handicap	
Severity Level of Primary Handicap	% of Total
Mild	22.7 (N=61)
Moderate	41.3 (N=111)
Severe	27.1 (N=73)
Profound	2.6 (N=7)
Not Relevant [1/]	3.0 (N=8)
No Response	3.3 (N=9)
Total**	100.00 (N=269)

[1/] Includes 6 children who were blind and 2 children who were deaf.

TABLE 4.3: DATE OF ENROLLMENT

(Question 3)

Dates of Initial Enrollment	Head Start % of Column
1974	3.7 (N=10)
1975	20.4 (N=55)
1976	71.4 (N=192)
1977	4.5 (N=12)
Total	100 (n=269)

TABLE 4.4

PROGRAM OPTIONS AVAILABLE

(Questions 4 and 4a)

Program Options	Question 4[1/] Options Available % of Children	Question 4a[1/] Actual Placement % of Children
5 days a week, center based full time	59.9 (N=161)	23.4 (N=63)
4 days a week, full time	16.7 (N=45)	5.2 (N=14)
Split sessions	9.3 (N=25)	3.3 (N=9)
Other variations in center-based attendance	10.0 (N=27)	1.1 (N=3)
Double sessions (*part day*) 5 days a week	17.1 (N=46)	5.9 (N=16)
Double sessions (*part day*) less than 5 days a week	10.0 (N=27)	2.6 (N=7)
Home based, no center attendance	3.7 (N=10)	0.7 (N=2)
Home based, center attendance, 1-2 times weekly	6.3 (N=17)	0.7 (N=2)
Home based, other regular schedule for center attendance	1.9 (N=5)	1.1 (N=3)
Home based, variable center attendance	1.1 (N=3)	0.4 (N=1)
Locally-designed options	14.1 (N=38)	3.3 (N=9)
Other	0.0 (N=0)	52.1 (N=140)

[1/] Percentages based on 269 children in study.

TABLE 4.5A
MAINSTREAMING OPTIONS

(Questions 5 and 5a)

Mainstreaming Options	Question 5 Options Available % of Children (n=269)	Question 5a Actual Placement % of Children (n=269)
complete mainstreaming of handicapped child into a regular classroom (*no supportive assistance*)	59.1 (N=159)	38.7 (n=104)
complete mainstreaming of handicapped child into a regular classroom with supportive assistance provided by a specialist	60.6 (N=163)	49.4 (n=133)
complete mainstreaming of handicapped children in a classroom where the regular classroom teacher and a special education teacher cooperatively work with all children (*a team arrangement*)	12.3 (N=33)	4.5 (n=12)
reverse mainstreaming in which normal children become part of a special education class	7.1 (N=19)	1.5 (n=4)
partial mainstreaming where handicapped children are in a special education class but go to mainstreamed classes for one or more regular classroom activities	17.8 (N=48)	4.5 (n=12)
handicapped children receive services from your program but are <u>not</u> mainstreamed	5.2 (N=14)	1.5 (n=4)
not specified		

TABLE 4.5B
PERCENTAGE OF TIME CHILD SPENDS
IN MAINSTREAMED SITUATION
(Question 5b)

Percentage of Time	% of Children (N=269)
Up to 10	1.5 (N=4)
11 to 50	4.1 (N=11)
51 to 65	1.9 (N=5)
66 to 75	2.2 (N=6)
76 to 89	7.8 (N=21)
90 to 100	82.5 (N=222)

TABLE 4.6
DECISION FOR PLACEMENT OF
CHILD IN CURRENT CLASSROOM
(Question 6)

Primary Reason	% of Children
Nearest Head Start Classroom to Child's Residence	70.3 (N=189)
Classroom had special staff/facilities for the Handicapped	11.9 (N=32)
Classroom had special staff/facilities for this child's particular handicap	7.1 (N=19)
Only classroom with openings available	10.8 (N=29)

TABLE 4.7
HEADSTART WAS THE ONLY
EDUCATIONAL/DEVELOPMENTAL PLACEMENT
AVAILABLE TO THIS CHILD IN
THIS COMMUNITY
(Question 7)

Only Placement Available	% of Children
Yes	56.1 (N=151)
No	43.9 (N=118)

TABLE 4.8
AGREEMENT AMONG HEAD START PERSONNEL, THE CHILD'S PARENTS AND THE CHILD'S DISGNOSTICIANS ON HIS/HER PLACEMENT IN HEAD START RELATIVE TO OTHER PROGRAMS
(Question 7a)

Agreement	% of Children
Yes	98.1 (N=264)
No	1.9 (N=5)

TABLE 4.9
CLASSROOM INFORMATION
(Question 8)

Item	Mean Number
Number of children in child's classroom	18.31
Number of handicapped children in child's classroom	4.16
Number of teachers having instructional responsibility	1.85
Number of other adults typically in classroom	1.57
Handicapped/Non-Handicapped Ratios	1 to 3.4
Teacher/Pupil ratio	1 to 10.1
Adult/child ratio	1 to 8.6

TABLE 4.10A

Question #9

Educational Levels of Head Start Staff[1]						
Staff Position	Total % of Row	Less than high school % of Row	High school graduate % of Row	Associate degree/ some college % of Row	College graduate % of Row	Postgraduate education % of Row
Educational Coordinator	100.0 (N=140)	*	*	13.6 (N=19)	26.4 (N=37)	60.0 (N=84)
Teacher	100.0 (N=356)	2.8 (N=10)	14.3 (N=51)	40.4 (N=144)	23.9 (N=85)	18.6 (N=66)
Aide	100.0 (N=324)	17.6 (N=57)	44.7 (N=145)	35.2 (N=114)	2.5 (N=8)	*

[1] Data are staff-specific

TABLE 4.10B

Question #9a

Degree Areas of Head Start Staff by Staff Level[1]					
Staff Position	Total[2] % of Row	Special Education % of Row	Early Childhood Development % of Row	Other % of Row	No Response % of Row
Classroom Teacher	100.0 (N=151)	9.9 (N=15)	29.8 (N=45)	51.6 (N=78)	8.6 (N=13)
Aide	100.0 (N=8)	12.5 (N=1)	25.0 (N=2)	62.5 (N=5)	*
Educational Coordinator	100.0 (N=121)	14.0 (N=17)	39.7 (N=48)	37.2 (N=45)	9.1 (N=11)

[1] Data are staff-specific

[2] Includes only those staff who hold at least a college degree.

TABLE 4.10C

Question 9b

	Certification of Head Start Staff[1]				
	Total % of Row	State Certified For Special Education % of Row	Child Development Associate (Credentialed) % of Row	Child Development Associate (Participating) % of Row	Other % of Row
Classroom Teacher	100.0 (N=169)	16.6 (N=28)	7.7 (N=13)	24.9 (N=42)	50.9 (N=86)
Aide	100.0 (N=29)	0.0 (N=0)	6.9 (N=2)	72.4 (N=21)	20.7 (N=6)
Educational Coordinator	100.0 (N=71)	33.8 (N=24)	12.7 (N=9)	9.9 (N=7)	43.7 (N=31)

[1] Data are staff-specific.

TABLE 4.11
STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIRED
FOR WORKING WITH HANDICAPPED
PRE SCHOOLERS
(Question 10, 10a)

Item	Number of Children for Whom This Applies
Certification is required:	
No	224
Yes	44
Certification Requirements Pertain to Age and Handicapping condition of this child	
No	6
Yes	38

TABLE 4.12
(Question 11)

Head Start Staff Inservice Training Time by Training Type[1/]

Training Type	Total % of Row	No Specific Training % of Row	Time Not Specified % of Row	Hours of Inservice Training: 1-5 Hours % of Row	6-10 Hours % of Row	11-15 Hours % of Row	Over 15 Hours % of Row
Knowledge of Head Start Standards	100.0 (N=269)	49.1 (N=132)	.4 (N=1)	13.8 (N=37)	19.7 (N=53)	.8 (N=2)	13.0 (N=35)
Behavior Management	100.0 (N=269)	45.0 (N=121)	.4 (N=1)	16.4 (N=44)	14.5 (N=39)	1.5 (N=4)	22.3 (N=60)
Individualized Instruction	100.0 (N=269)	49.1 (N=132)	*	14.1 (N=38)	13.8 (N=37)	4.8 (N=13)	14.9 (N=40)
Individual Learning Objectives	100.0 (N=269)	51.3 (N=138)	*	14.9 (N=40)	15.2 (N=41)	3.7 (N=10)	14.9 (N=40)
Working With Parents	100.0 (N=269)	55.4 (N=149)	.4 (N=1)	14.1 (N=38)	13.8 (N=37)	*	16.4 (N=44)
Strategies to Recruit Handicapped Students	100.0 (N=269)	88.8 (N=239)	.4 (N=1)	2.6 (N=7)	3.0 (N=8)	*	5.2 (N=14)
Screening and Assessment	100.0 (N=269)	61.7 (N=166)	*	16.4 (N=44)	8.2 (N=22)	1.5 (N=4)	12.3 (N=33)
Theory and Practice of Mainstreaming	100.0 (N=269)	86.2 (N=232)	*	1.9 (N=5)	1.5 (N=4)	3.3 (N=9)	7.1 (N=19)
Specific Training for One Child's Handicap	100.0 (N=269)	69.5 (N=187)	*	8.9 (N=24)	7.4 (N=20)	3.7 (N=10)	10.4 (N=28)
Understanding Handicapping Conditions	100.0 (N=269)	41.2 (N=111)	.4 (N=1)	17.5 (N=47)	18.6 (N=50)	2.6 (N=7)	19.7 (N=53)
Other	100.0 (N=269)	79.9 (N=215)	*	6.3 (N=17)	7.1 (N=19)	*	7.8 (N=21)

[1/] This table only includes training each child's staff received related to handicapped children. Date are child-specific.

TABLE 4.13
(Question 11)

Head Start Staff Inservice Training Type by Provider[1/]

Training Type	Total[2/] % of Row	Type of Provider: Resource Acess Program % of Row	Head Start Personnel % of Row	Public School Personnel % of Row	University/ College % of Row	Private Consultant % of Row	Public Health Dept. % of Row	Private Organization % of Row	Other[3/] % of Row
Knowledge of Head Start Standards	100.0 (N=137)	1.4 (N=2)	84.7 (N=116)	5.1 (N=7)	6.6 (N=9)	*	*	*	2.2 (N=3)
Behavior Management	100.0 (N=140)	*	15.7 (N=22)	2.2 (N=3)	21.4 (N=30)	30.7 (N=43)	9.3 (N=13)	1.4 (N=2)	19.3 (N=27)
Individualized Instruction	100.0 (N=124)	16.9 (N=21)	34.7 (N=43)	13.8 (N=17)	16.9 (N=21)	2.4 (N=3)	*	4.0 (N=5)	11.3 (N=14)
Individual Learning Objectives	100.0 (N=129)	*	49.6 (N=64)	5.5 (N=7)	15.5 (N=20)	15.5 (N=20)	*	2.3 (N=3)	11.6 (N=15)
Working With Parents	100.0 (N=120)	0.8 (N=1)	55.8 (N=67)	5.0 (N=6)	7.5 (N=9)	12.5 (N=15)	2.6 (N=3)	*	15.8 (N=19)
Strategies to Recruit Handicapped Students	100.0 (N=30)	36.7 (N=11)	30.0 (N=9)	*	10.0 (N=3)	20.0 (N=6)		3.3 (N=1)	*
Screening and Assessment	100.0 (N=101)	*	56.5 (N=57)	4.0 (N=4)	15.8 (N=16)	5.9 (N=6)	1.0 (N=1)	5.9 (N=6)	10.9 (N=11)
Theory and Practice of Mainstreaming	100.0 (N=30)	*	16.7 (N=5)	16.7 (N=5)	10.0 (N=3)	16.7 (N=5)	*	13.3 (N=4)	26.6 (N=8)
Specific Training for One Child's Handicap	100.0 (N=80)	12.6 (N=10)	20.0 (N=16)	16.2 (N=13)	11.2 (N=9)	10.0 (N=8)	*	18.8 (N=15)	11.2 (N=9)
Understanding Handicapping Conditions	100.0 (N=146)	*	30.1 (N=44)	6.2 (N=9)	14.4 (N=21)	23.3 (N=34)	1.4 (N=2)	6.8 (N=10)	17.8 (N=26)
Other	100.0 (N=54)	*	16.8 (N=9)	1.8 (N=1)	11.1 (N=6)	7.4 (N=4)	11.1 (N=6)	11.1 (N=6)	40.7 (N=22)

1/ This Table only includes training each child's staff received related to handicapped children. Data are child-specific.

2/ Each row total represents the number of children whose staff received the corresponding type of training. Totals are based on providers indicated.

3/ Includes BEH and University Affiliated Facilities.

TABLE 4.14

(Question 12)

Additional Training Requested for Head Start Staff by Priority Ranking[1/]

Priority	Training Types										
	Knowledge of Head Start Performance Standards % of Column	Behavior Modification/ Classroom Management % of Column	Individualized Instructional Techniques % of Column	Preparation of Individual Learning Objectives % of Column	Working With Parents % of Column	Strategies for Recruitment of Handicapped Children % of Column	Screening and Assessment % of Column	Theory and Practice of Mainstreaming % of Column	Working With This Child's Handicap % of Column	Understanding Handicapping Conditions % of Column	Other % of Column
Total	100.0 (N=269)	100.0 (N=269)	100.0 (N=269)	100.0 (N=269)	100.0 (N=269)	100.0 (N=269)	100.0 (N=269)	100.0 (N=269)	100.0 (N=269)	100.0 (N=269)	100.0 (N=269)
Highest Priority	1.1 (N=3)	5.9 (N=16)	12.6 (N=34)	7.4 (N=20)	8.2 (N=22)	1.9 (N=5)	3.7 (N=10)	1.9 (n=5)	29.7 (N=80)	11.9 (N=32)	4.8 (N=13)
Next Highest Priority	*	7.1 (N=19)	14.1 (N=38)	11.9 (N=32)	6.7 (N=18)	1.1 (N=3)	6.3 (N=17)	3.3 (N=9)	17.8 (N=48)	16.7 (N=45)	0.7 (N=2)
Other Priorities	7.8 (N=21)	17.9 (N=48)	31.3 (N=48)	26.4 (N=71)	35.7 (N=96)	13.0 (N=35)	16.4 (N=44)	17.5 (N=47)	19.4 (N=52)	24.6 (N=66)	4.5 (N=12)
Not a Priority	91.1 (N=245)	69.1 (N=186)	42.0 (N=113)	54.3 (N=146)	49.4 (N=133)	84.0 (N=226)	73.6 (N=198)	77.3 (N=208)	33.1 (N=89)	46.8 (N=126)	90.0 (N=242)

[1/] Data are child-specific

TABLE 4.15
(Question 13)

How Handicapped Children Came to the Attention of Head Start Programs	
Manner of Recruitment	% of Total
Referred by outside agency, not because of handicap	2.2 (N=6)
Referred by outside agency, because of handicap	26.0 (N=70)
Enrolled through normal recruitment/ child find activities	53.5 (N=144)
Enrolled through special recruitment/ child find activities	3.3 (N=9)
Parent referred/other siblings previously in Head Start	14.9 (N=40)
Total**	100 (N=269)

TABLE 4.16
REFERAL BY OUTSIDE AGENCY
WHICH IS PART OF USUAL RECRUITMENT/
CHILD FIND NETWORK
(Question 13a)

Outside Agencies Are Part of Normal Recruitment Network	% of Head Start Children (N=269)
Yes	21.6 (N=58)
No	5.2 (N=14)

TABLE 4.17
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBLE
FOR CHILD'S REFERRAL
(Question 13b)

Professional Responsible for Referral	% of Headstart Children (n=76) 1/
1. psychologist/psychiatrist	11.8 (N=9)
2. pediatrician/other medical personnel	18.4 (N=14)
3. speech therapist/audiologist	10.5 (N=8)
4. paraprofessional medical personnel	1.3 (N=1)
5. social worker	26.3 (N=20)
6. public health nurse	1.3 (N=1)
7. interdisciplinary team	14.5 (N=11)
8. other	17.1 (N=13)

1/ Percentages based on children referred by outside agencies.

TABLE 4.18
OUTSIDE AGENCY RESPONSIBLE
FOR REFERRAL
(Question 13b)

	Agency Responsible for Referral	% of Head Start Children (n=76)[1/]
1.	private practitioner/consultant	6.7 (N=5)
2.	hospital (*public*)	9.2 (N=7)
3.	public or State health department	9.2 (N=7)
4.	social services department (*local or State agency*)	17.1 (N=13)
5.	public school system	18.4 (N=14)
6.	Easter Seal Agency	2.6 (N=2)
7.	Crippled Children Association	3.9 (N=3)
8.	Association for Retarded Children	0.0 (N=0)
9.	BEH First Chance Project	1.3 (N=1)
10.	University Affiliated Facilities (UAF)	5.3 (N=4)
11.	other	27.6 (N=21)

[1/] Percentages based on children referred by outside agency.

TABLE 4.19
(Question 14)

Completion of Screening Prior to/After Enrollment in Head Start	
When Screening is Completed	% of Total
No screening services reported	10.4 (N=28) [1/]
Prior to enrollment	24.9 (N=67)
After enrollment	63.9 (N=172)
Initiated prior to enrollment and completed after enrollment	0.7 (N=2)
Total**	100 (N=269)

[1/] Includes 15 children for whom no screening services were provided and 13 children referred to Head Start because of identified handicaps but for whom Head Start staff had no knowledge of screening services these children may have received.

TABLE 4.20
(Question 14)

Month of Screening Completion for Children Who Received Complete Screening After Enrollment[1]	
Month Screening Completed	% of Total
Prior to August, 1976	14.7 (N=14)
August - October, 1976	27.4 (N=26)
November, 1976 - January, 1977	44.2 (N=42)
February - April, 1977	9.5 (N=9)
After April, 1977	4.2 (N=4)
Total	100.0 (N=95)[2]

[1] Does not include 41 children who received complete screening services that were, in part, provided by agencies other than Head Start (and not coordinated with the Head Start screening process).

[2] 136 children screened less 41 = 95.

TABLE 4.21
(Question 15)

Completeness of Screening Services Provided to the Head Start Sample Children	
Completeness of Screening	**% of Total**
No screening services reported	5.6 (N=15)
Complete screening as specified under Head Start Performance Standards	18.2 (N=49)
Complete screening as specified under Head Start Performance Standards plus additional screening services	32.3 (N=87)
Partial screening	24.5 (N=66)
Partial screening plus some additional screening	19.3 (N=52)
Total**	100 (N=269)

TABLE 4.22
(Question 15a)

Proportion of Sample Children Screened in Each Screening Area	
Area Screening	% of Total[1/]
Vision	84.4 (N=227)
Hearing	87.0 (N=234)
Physical Coordination and Development	76.2 (N=201)
Speech and Language	76.6 (N=206)
Intellectual Development	70.1 (N=191)
Social/Emotional Development	68.0 (N=183)

[1/] A total percentage was not computed since children could be screened in more than one area. Percentages are based on the sample of children (N=269).

TABLE 4.23
(Question 15a)

Month of Completion of Regular Screening[1] by Screening Area						
	Regular Screening Area					
Month Screening Completed	Vision % of Column	Hearing % of Column	Physical Coordination and Development % of Column	Speech and Language % of Column	Intellectual Development % of Column	Social/ Emotional Development % of Column
Total**	100 (N=172)	100 (N=172)	100 (N=172)	100 (N=172)	100 (N=172)	100 (N=172)
Prior to August, 1976	12.2 (N=21)	15.1 (N=26)	15.1 (N=26)	15.1 (N=26)	12.8 (N=22)	12.8 (N=22)
August - October, 1976	39.0 (N=67)	33.8 (N=58)	34.3 (N=59)	40.7 (N=70)	40.7 (N=70)	36.0 (N=62)
November, 1976- January, 1977	26.2 (N=45)	38.4 (N=66)	29.1 (N=50)	23.2 (N=40)	19.2 (N=33)	18.0 (N=31)
February - April, 1977	9.9 (N=17)	1.7 (N=3)	2.9 (N=5)	1.2 (N=2)	1.8 (N=3)	5.8 (N=10)
After April, 1977	0.6 (N=1)	0.6 (N=1)	0.6 (N=1)	1.7 (N=3)	1.8 (N=3)	1.7 (N=3)
Not Specified/ Not Screened	12.2 (N=21)	10.5 (N=18)	18.0 (N=31)	18.0 (N=31)	23.8 (N=41)	25.6 (N=44)

[1] Including only sample children for whom screening was completed after enrollment (N=172)

TABLE 4.24
(Question 15a)

Type of Service Provider Who Performed Regular Screening in Each Screening Area

Screening Area	Total** % by Row	Not Reported % by Row	Psychologist/ Psychiatrist % by Row	Pediatrician/ Other Licensed Medical Professional % by Row	Providers: Speech Therapist/ Audiologist % by Row	Para-professional Medical Personnel % by Row	Social Worker % by Row	Public Health Nurse % by Row	Interdis-ciplinary Team % by Row	Head Start Staff Teacher % by Row	Other % by Row
Vision	100 (N=269)	15.6 (N=42)	0.4 (N=1)	14.5 (N=39)	2.6 (N=7)	9.7 (N=26)	0.4 (N=1)	20.4 (N=55)	2.6 (N=7)	6.7 (N=18)	27.1 (N=73)
Hearing	100 (N=269)	13.0 (N=35)	*	8.6 (N=23)	35.7 (N=96)	7.8 (N=21)	*	15.2 (N=41)	4.8 (N=13)	1.9 (N=5)	13.0 (N=35)
Physical Coordination and Development	100 (N=269)	23.8 (N=68)	1.9 (N=5)	29.4 (N=79)	1.9 (N=5)	0.4 (N=1)	*	5.6 (N=15)	11.5 (N=31)	19.0 (N=51)	6.7 (N=18)
Speech and Language	100 (N=269)	23.4 (N=63)	2.6 (N=7)	5.6 (N=89)	33.1 (N=89	1.1 (N=3)	*	2.2 (N=6)	8.9 (N=24)	19.3 (N=52)	3.7 (N=10)
Intellectual Development	100 (N=269)	29.9 (N=78)	7.4 (N=20)	3.7 (N=10)	3.3 (N=9)	*	0.4 (N=1)	2.2 (N=6)	5.2 (N=14)	45.4 (N=122)	3.3 (N=9)
Social/ Emotional Development	100 (N=269)	32.0 (N=86)	9.3 (N=25)	3.3 (N=9)	2.6 (N=7)	*	1.1 (N=3)	2.6 (N=7)	4.8 (N=13)	10.9 (N=110)	3.3 (N=9)

TABLE 4.25
(Question 15a)

Funding Sources for Regular Screening by Screening Area

Screening Area	Funding Source							
	Total** % of Row	Head Start Basic Grant % of Row	Head Start Supplemental (P.A. 26) % of Row	Joint Funding [1] (Head Start/ other agency) % of Row	Public Schools % of Row	State Funds % of Row	Other [2] % of Row	No Response % of Row
Vision	100 (N=269)	44.6 (N=120)	6.3 (N=17)	*	7.8 (N=21)	9.3 (N=25)	14.9 (N=40)	17.1 (N=46)
Hearing	100 (N=269)	31.2 (N=84)	17.5 (N=47)	0.4 (N=1)	8.6 (N=23)	12.3 (N=33)	15.6 (N=42)	14.5 (N=39)
Physical Coordination and Development	100 (N=269)	43.9 (N=118)	9.3 (N=25)	*	2.2 (N=6)	7.1 (N=19)	13.4 (N=36)	24.2 (N=65)
Speech and Language	100 (N=269)	24.5 (N=66)	24.2 (N=65)	1.5 (N=4)	7.8 (N=21)	8.6 (N=23)	8.9 (N=24)	24.5 (N=66)
Intellectual Development	100 (N=269)	47.6 (N=128)	7.4 (N=20)	1.1 (N=3)	2.2 (N=6)	4.8 (N=13)	6.3 (N=17)	30.5 (N=82)
Social/Emotional Development	100 (N=269)	42.0 (N=113)	12.3 (N=33)	0.7 (N=2)	2.6 (N=7)	3.7 (N=10)	5.6 (N=15)	33.1 (N=89)

[1] Does not include Head Start/BEH Joint Funding

[2] Includes Head Start/BEH Joint Funding, EPSDT, and other Education for the Handicapped Act Funds

TABLE 4.26
(Question 16)

Reason for Use of Agencies/Professionals for Regular Screening Services by Screening Area

Screening Area	Total** % of Row	Reasons: Not Reported % of Row	Least Expensive Service Available % of Row	Best Service Available % of Row	Only Service Available % of Row	Part of Established Screening Service with Which Program is Associated % of Row	Agency Used for This Particular Child-Screening Not Generally Provided to All Head Start Enrollees % of Row	No Choice in the Matter; Child Was Screened Prior to Referral % of Row	Other % of Row
Vision	100 (N=269)	15.6 (N=42)	8.6 (N=23)	9.7 (N=26)	6.3 (N=17)	56.9 (N=153)	0.7 (N=2)	1.9 (N=5)	0.4 (N=1)
Hearing	100 (N=269)	13.4 (N=36)	6.3 (N=27)	14.5 (N=39)	5.9 (N=16)	54.6 (N=147)	1.1 (N=3)	3.7 (N=10)	0.4 (N=1)
Physical Coordination and Development	100 (N=269)	23.8 (N=64)	7.8 (N=21)	14.9 (N=40)	3.7 (N=10)	39.8 (N=107)	2.6 (N=7)	5.6 (N=15)	1.9 (N=5)
Speech and Language	100 (N=269)	23.8 (N=64)	5.9 (N=16)	13.8 (N=37)	7.4 (N=20)	43.1 (N=116)	1.9 (N=5)	3.0 (N=8)	1.1 (N=3)
Intellectual Development	100 (N=269)	29.7 (N=80)	7.8 (N=21)	11.5 (N=31)	5.2 (N=14)	39.4 (N=106)	2.6 (N=7)	2.6 (N=7)	1.1 (N=3)
Social Emotional Development	100 (N=269)	31.2 (N=84)	5.9 (N=16)	10.4 (N=28)	5.2 (N=14)	42.0 (N=113)	1.5 (N=4)	1.9 (N=5)	1.9 (N=5)

4.28

TABLE 4.27
(Question 16)

Agencies That Provided Regular Screening Services to Head Start by Screening Area

Screening Area	Agency										
	Total** % of Row	Not Reported % of Row	Private Practitioner/ Consultant % of Row	Hospital % of Row	Public or State Health Department % of Row	Social Services Department % of Row	Public School System % of Row	Easter Seal Agency % of Row	University Affiliated Facilities % of Row	Other % of Row	Head Start % of Row
Vision	100 (N=269)	16.0 (N=43)	8.2 (N=22)	1.5 (N=4)	19.0 (N=51)	0.7 (N=2)	7.1 (N=19)	*	1.9 (N=5)	10.8 (N=29)	34.9 (N=94)
Hearing	100 (N=269)	13.0 (N=35)	6.7 (N=18)	1.9 (N=5)	19.3 (N=52)	1.1 (N=3)	10.0 (N=27)	*	11.5 (N=31)	14.1 (N=38)	20.8 (N=56)
Physical Coordination and Development	100 (N=269)	23.0 (N=62)	14.9 (N=40)	4.1 (N=11)	10.0 (N=27)	0.7 (N=4)	1.5 (N=4)	*	3.0 (N=8)	11.5 (N=31)	31.2 (N=84)
Speech and Language	100 (N=269)	23.4 (N=63)	12.6 (N=34)	3.3 (N=9)	3.3 (N=9)	0.7 (N=2)	7.4 (N=20)	1.5 (N=4)	10.0 (N=27)	13.8 (N=37)	23.8 (N=64)
Intellectual Development	100 (N=269)	29.0 (N=78)	4.1 (N=11)	1.1 (N=3)	3.0 (N=8)	*	2.2 (N=6)	*	1.5 (N=4)	11.9 (N=32)	47.2 (N=127)
Social/ Emotional Development	100 (N=269)	30.9 (N=83)	5.6 (N=15)	1.1 (N=2)	3.3 (N=9)	0.4 (N=1)	1.1 (N=3)	*	1.5 (N=4)	8.6 (N=23)	47.6 (N=128)

TABLE 4.28
(Question 16)

Agencies That Provided Additional Screening Services to Head Start by Screening Area

Screening Area	Agency									
	Total** % of Row	Not Reported % of Row	Private Practitioner/ Consultant % of Row	Hospital % of Row	Public or State Health Department % of Row	Public School System % of Row	Easter Seal Agency % of Row	University Affiliated Facilities % of Row	Other % of Row	Head Start % of Row
Vision	100 (N=269)	87.7 (N=236)	5.2 (N=14)	0.7 (N=2)	2.6 (N=7)	0.4 (N=1)	*	1.1 (N=3)	1.1 (N=3)	1.1 (N=3)
Hearing	100 (N=269)	79.6 (N=214)	5.9 (N=16)	9.7 (N=2)	4.1 (N=11)	0.7 (N=2)	2.6 (N=7)	2.2 (N=6)	3.3 (N=9)	0.7 (N=2)
Physical Coordination and Development	100 (N=269)	81.4 (N=219)	3.7 (N=10)	1.9 (N=5)	1.9 (N=3)	2.2 (N=6)	*	2.2 (N=6)	4.1 (N=11)	3.3 (N=9)
Speech and Language Development	100 (N=269)	72.5 (N=195)	4.5 (N=12)	0.4 (N=1)	0.4 (N=1)	4.8 (N=13)	1.9 (N=5)	4.1 (N=11)	5.6 (N=15)	5.9 (N=16)
Intellectual Development	100 (N=269)	83.6 (N=225)	1.1 (N=3)	0.7 (N=2)	*	4.8 (N=13)	*	3.7 (N=10)	3.0 (N=8)	3.0 (N=8)
Social/ Emotional Development	100 (N=269)	84.0 (N=226)	5.9 (N=16)	*	0.4 (N=1)	3.7 (N=10)	*	1.9 (N=5)	2.6 (N=7)	1.5 (N=4)

TABLE 4.29
(Question 17)

Areas Where Screening Indicated a Potential Handicap by Reported Primary Handicapping Condition

Handicapping Condition	Total**	Screening Areas: Vision % of Row	Hearing % of Row	Physical Coordination and Development % of Row	Intellectual Development % of Row	Speech and Language Development % of Row	Social/Emotional Development % of Row
Visually Impaired	(N=15)	93.3 (N=14)	6.7 (N=1)	20.0 (N=3)	20.0 (N=3)	13.3 (N=2)	20.0 (N=3)
Blind	(N=6)	83.3 (N=5)	16.7 (N=1)	33.3 (N=2)	16.7 (N=1)	33.3 (N=2)	33.3 (N=2)
Hearing Impaired	(N=21)	4.8 (N=1)	90.5 (N=19)	23.8 (N=5)	19.0 (N=4)	42.8 (N=9)	19.0 (N=4)
Deaf	(N=2)	*	*	*	*	100.0 (N=2)	*
Physically Handicapped	(N=37)	18.9 (N=7)	5.4 (N=2)	73.0 (N=27)	18.9 (N=7)	37.8 (N=14)	18.9 (N=7)
Speech Impaired	(N=59)	3.4 (N=2)	6.8 (N=4)	13.6 (N=8)	11.2 (N=7)	93.2 (N=55)	15.2 (N=9)
Health/Developmentally Impaired	(N=30)	10.0 (N=3)	16.8 (N=5)	80.0 (N=24)	30.0 (N=9)	40.0 (N=12)	30.0 (N=9)
Mentally Retarded	(N=35)	8.6 (N=3)	14.3 (N=5)	51.4 (N=18)	77.4 (N=24)	57.1 (N=20)	28.6 (N=10)
Learning Disabled	(N=31)	9.7 (N=3)	12.9 (N=4)	45.2 (N=14)	71.0 (N=22)	64.5 (N=20)	54.8 (N=17)
Emotionally Disturbed	(N=33)	9.1 (N=3)	18.2 (N=6)	15.2 (N=5)	30.3 (N=10)	33.3 (N=11)	90.9 (N=30)

Note: Each percentage was derived from the total number of cases within each handicap classification. Thus, the first cell shows that 14, or 93.3%, of the 15 cases in which visual impairment was reported as the primary handicapping condition, received screening in the vision diagnostic area. The screening areas of primary concern to each handicapping condition are enclosed in boxes.

TABLE 4.30
(Question 18)

Dates of Confirmation of Handicap for Head Start Children		
Confirmation Date	Percent of Primary Handicaps	Percent of all[1/] Handicaps
August 1 - October 31, 1976	12.4 (N=36)	14.6 (N=69)
November 1, 1976 - January 31, 1977	21.6 (N=58)	29.3 (N=139)
February 1 - April 30, 1977	15.6 (N=42)	20.2 (N=96)
After April 30, 1977	1.5 (N=4)	1.3 (N=6)
Prior to August 1, 1976	33.5 (N=90)	34.0 (N=161)
No Confirmation	10.8 (N=29)	n/a
Date Unknown	3.7 (N=10)	0.6 (N=3)
TOTAL **	100 (N=269)	100 (N=474)

[1/] Includes both primary and secondary confirmed handicaps.

TABLE 4.31
(Question 18)

Dates of Confirmation of Handicap in Area of Primary Concern by Handicapping Condition for Head Start Children

Confirmation Date	Diagnostic Area and Handicapping Condition					
	Vision Confirmation		Hearing Confirmation		Physical Confirmation	
	Visually Impaired % of Column	Blind % of Column	Hearing Impaired % of Column	Deaf % of Column	Physical Handicap % of Column	Health/Developmentally Impaired % of Column
Total**	100 (N=15)	100 (N=6)	100 (N=21)	100 (N=2)	100 (N=37)	100 (N=30)
August 1 - October 31, 1976	13.3 (N=2)	*	*	*	13.5 (N=5)	13.3 (N=4)
November 1, 1976 January 31, 1977	20.0 (N=3)	*	42.9 (N=9)	*	10.8 (N=4)	6.7 (N=2)
February 1 - April 30, 1977	13.3 (N=2)	16.7 (N=1)	9.5 (N=2)	50.0 (N=1)	2.7 (N=1)	16.7 (N=5)
After April 30, 1977	6.7 (N=1)	*	*	*	*	*
Prior to August 1, 1976	40.0 (N=6)	66.7 (N=4)	42.9 (N=9)	50.0 (N=1)	64.9 (N=24)	43.3 (N=13)
No Confirmation	6.7 (N=1)	16.7 (N=1)	4.8 (N=1)	*	5.4 (N=2)	20.0 (N=6)
Date Unknown	*	*	*	*	2.7 (N=1)	*

Confirmation Date	Diagnostic Area and Handicapping Condition				
	Speech Confirmation	Intellectual Confirmation		Social/Emotional Confirmation	
	Speech Impaired % of Column	Specific Learning Disability % of Column	Mentally Retarded % of Column	Mentally Retarded % of Column	Serious Emotional Disturbance % of Column
Total**	100 (N=59)	100 (N=31)	100 (N=35)	100 (N=35)	100 (N=33)
August 1 - October 31, 1976	25.4 (N=15)	16.1 (N=5)	2.9 (N=1)	*	12.1 (N=4)
November 1, 1976 - January 31, 1977	28.8 (N=17)	25.8 (N=8)	25.7 (N=9)	5.7 (N=2)	18.2 (N=6)
February 1 - April 30, 1977	25.4 (N=15)	9.7 (N=3)	8.6 (N=3)	2.9 (N=1)	27.3 (N=9)
After April 30, 1977	*	*	2.9 (N=1)	*	6.1 (N=2)
Prior to August 1, 1976	16.9 (N=10)	22.6 (N=7)	37.1 (N=13)	20.0 (N=7)	9.1 (N=3)
No Confirmation	1.7 (N=1)	25.8 (N=8)	22.9 (N=8)	68.6 (N=24)	27.3 (N=9)
Date Unknown	1.7 (N=1)	*	*	2.9 (N=1)	*

TABLE 4.32A
(Question 18)

Distribution of Funding Sources Used to Obtain Confirmation of Handicap by Diagnostic Area

Diagnostic Area	Source of Funding							
	Total** % of Row	Head Start Basic Grant % of Row	Head Start Supplemental (P.A.26) % of Row	Inkind Services % of Row	Joint Funding (Head Start/ Other agency) % of Row	Public Schools (Reimbursement of Services) % of Row	State Funds % of Row	Other[1] % of Row
Vision	100 (N=34)	14.7 (N=5)	17.6 (N=6)	*	*	2.9 (N=1)	29.4 (N=10)	35.3 (N=12)
Hearing	100 (N=41)	12.2 (N=5)	29.3 (N=12)	7.3 (N=3)	*	*	17.1 (N=7)	34.1 (N=14)
Physical Coordination and Development	100 (N=102)	8.8 (N=9)	16.7 (N=17)	2.9 (N=3)	2.9 (N=3)	3.9 (N=4)	27.5 (N=28)	37.3 (N=38)
Intellectual Development	100 (N=87)	18.4 (N=16)	35.6 (N=31)	2.3 (N=2)	2.3 (N=2)	5.9 (N=6)	20.7 (N=18)	13.8 (N=12)
Speech and Language	100 (N=139)	10.8 (N=15)	39.6 (N=55)	0.7 (N=1)	2.2 (N=3)	7.2 (N=10)	15.1 (N=21)	24.5 (N=34)
Social/Emotional Development	100 (N=73)	28.8 (N=21)	31.5 (N=23)	6.8 (N=5)	2.7 (N=2)	5.5 (N=4)	11.0 (N=8)	13.7 (N=10)

[1] Includes EPSDT, Head Start/BEH Joint Funding, and other Education for the Handicapped Act Funds

TABLE 4.32B
(Question 18)

Professional Providers Who Did Confirmation of Handicaps by Diagnostic Area

Diagnostic Area	Provider of Confirmation of Handicap							
	Total ** % of Row	Psychologist/ Psychiatrist % of Row	Pediatrician/ Other Licensed Medical Professional % of Row	Speech Therapist/ Audiologist % of Row	Paraprofessional Medical Personnel % of Row	Interdisciplinary Team % of Row	Head Start Staff Teacher % of Row	Other % of Row
Vision	100 (N=34)	2.9 (N=1)	76.5 (N=26)	*	*	*	*	20.6 (N=7)
Hearing	100 (N=41)	*	34.1 (N=14)	63.4 (N=26)	*	2.4 (N=1)	*	
Physical Coordination and Development	100 (N=102)	14.7 (N=15)	54.9 (N=56)	1.0 (N=1)	*	10.8 (N=11)	2.9 (N=3)	15.7 (N=16)
Intellectual Development	100 (N=87)	55.2 (N=48)	13.8 (N=12)	*	*	18.4 (N=16)	4.6 (N=4)	8.0 (N=7)
Speech and Language Development	100 (N=139)	6.5 (N=9)	3.6 (N=5)	74.1 (N=103)	0.7 (N=1)	6.5 (N=9)	1.4 (N=2)	7.2 (N=10)
Social/Emotional Development	100 (N=73)	71.2 (N=52)	11.0 (N=8)	1.4 (N=1)	1.4 (N=1)	9.6 (N=7)	2.7 (N=2)	2.7 (N=2)

TABLE 4.33
(Question 18)

Agencies Providing Confirmation of Handicap by Diagnostic Area

Diagnostic Area	Agency								
	Total** % of Row	Private Practitioner/ Consultant % of Row	Hospital (public) % of Row	Local or State Health/ Social Services Department % of Row	Public School System % of Row	Easter Seal/ Crippled Children Assoc./ Assoc. for Retarded Children % of Row	University Affiliated Facilities % of Row	Head Start % of Row	Other % of Row
Vision	100 (N=34)	47.1 (N=16)	8.8 (N=3)	8.8 (N=3)	*	2.9 (N=1)	14.7 (N=5)	*	17.6 (N=6)
Hearing	100 (N=41)	39.0 (N=16)	4.9 (N=2)	4.9 (N=2)	*	4.9 (N=2)	4.9 (N=2)	7.3 (N=3)	34.1 (N=14)
Physical Coordination and Development	100 (N=102)	25.5 (N=26)	14.7 (N=15)	7.8 (N=8)	3.9 (N=4)	9.8 (N=10)	9.8 (N=10)	4.9 (N=5)	23.5 (N=24)
Intellectual Development	100 (N=87)	24.1 (N=21)	2.3 (N=2)	4.6 (N=4)	12.6 (N=11)	2.3 (N=2)	12.6 (N=11)	9.2 (N=8)	32.2 (N=28)
Speech and Language	100 (N=139)	19.4 (N=27)	3.6 (N=5)	4.3 (N=6)	15.1 (N=21)	5.8 (N=8)	11.5 (N=16)	15.1 (N=21)	25.2 (N=35)
Social/Emotional Development	100 (N=73)	38.4 (N=28)	*	4.6 (N=3)	5.5 (N=4)	1.4 (N=1)	5.5 (N=4)	8.2 (N=6)	37.0 (N=27)

133

TABLE 4.34
(Question 18)

Frequency of Functional Assessments Made in the Appropriate Developmental Area by Reported Primary Handicapping Condition

Handicapping Condition and (Appropriate Developmental Area)[1]	Total % of Row	Functional Assessment Performed % of Row	No Reported Functional Assessment % of Row
Total (Across all Areas)	100.0 (N=269)	82.2 (N=221)	17.8 (N=48)
Visually Impaired (Vision)	100.0 (N=15)	60.0 (N=9)	40.0 (N=6)
Blind (Vision)	100.0 (N=6)	66.7 (N=4)	33.3 (N=2)
Hearing Impaired (Hearing)	100.0 (N=21)	81.0 (N=17)	19.0 (N=4)
Deaf (Hearing)	100.0 (N=2)	100.0 (N=2)	*
Physical Handicap (Physical Coordination/Development)	100.0 (N=37)	94.6 (N=35)	5.4 (N=2)
Health/Developmentally Impaired (Physical Coordination/Development)	100.0 (N=30)	60.0 (N=18)	40.0 (N=12)
Speech Impaired (Speech and Language)	100.0 (N=59)	91.5 (N=54)	8.5 (N=5)
Specific Learning Disability (Intellectual Development)	100.0 (N=31)	74.2 (N=23)	25.8 (N=8)
Serious Emotional Disturbance (Social/Emotional Development)	100.0 (N=33)	72.7 (N=24)	27.3 (N=9)
Mentally Retarded (Intellectual or Social/ Emotional Development)	100.0 (N=33)	[2]	[3]

[1] The appropriate developmental area was determined on the basis of OCD Notice A-30-333-4, "Announcement of Diagnostic Criteria for Reporting Handicapped Children in Head Start."

[2] Twenty-five mentally retarded cases received a functional assessment in intellectual development; 13 mentally retarded children received an assessment in social/emotional development. Some of the 33 mentally retarded children received assessments in both areas. Due to this overlap, it is assumed that all mentally retarded cases received an assessment in an appropriate developmental area.

[3] It is assumed that N=0.

TABLE 4.35
(Question 18)

Agencies that Provide Functional Assessment by Diagnostic Area

Diagnostic Area	Agency								
	Total** % of Row	Private Consultant/ Practitioner % of Row	Hospital (public) % of Row	Local or State Health/ Social Services Department % of Row	Public School System % of Row	Easter Seal/ Crippled Children Assoc./ Assoc. for Retarded Children % of Row	University Affiliated Facilities % of Row	Head Start % of Row	Other % of Row
Vision	100 (N=35)	40.0 (N=14)	5.7 (N=2)	8.6 (N=3)	*	2.9 (N=1)	2.9 (N=1)	25.7 (N=9)	14.3 (N=5)
Hearing	100 (N=41)	19.5 (N=8)	4.9 (N=2)	2.4 (N=1)	7.3 (N=3)	4.9 (N=2)	7.3 (N=3)	24.4 (N=10)	29.3 (N=12)
Physical Coordination and Development	100 (N=103)	20.4 (N=21)	12.6 (N=13)	7.8 (N=8)	5.8 (N=6)	8.7 (N=9)	7.8 (N=8)	16.5 (N=17)	20.4 (N=21)
Intellectual Development	100 (N=97)	20.6 (N=20)	2.1 (N=2)	4.1 (N=4)	11.3 (N=11)	2.1 (N=2)	10.3 (N=10)	22.7 (N=22)	26.8 (N=26)
Speech and Language	100 (N=147)	23.1 (N=34)	3.4 (N=5)	3.4 (N=5)	14.3 (N=21)	5.4 (N=8)	8.8 (N=13)	16.4 (N=24)	25.2 (N=37)
Social/Emotional Development	100 (N=91)	34.1 (N=31)	*	4.4 (N=4)	5.5 (N=5)	1.1 (N=1)	4.4 (N=4)	23.1 (N=21)	27.5 (N=25)

TABLE 4.36
(Question 18)

Professionals Who Provided Functional Assessment by Diagnostic Area

Diagnostic Area	Provider of Functional Assessment							
	Total** % of Row	Psychologist/ Psychiatrist % of Row	Pediatrician/ Other Licensed Medical Professional % of Row	Speech Therapist/ Audiologist % of Row	Paraprofessional Medical Personnel % of Row	Interdisciplinary Team % of Row	Head Start Staff Teacher % of Row	Other % of Row
Vision	100 (N=35)	2.9 (N=1)	68.6 (N=24)	*	8.6 (N=3)	*	2.9 (N=1)	17.1 (N=6)
Hearing	100 (N=41)	*	31.7 (N=13)	63.4 (N=26)	*	4.9 (N=2)	*	*
Physical Coordination and Development	100 (N=102)	10.8 (N=11)	42.2 (N=43)	*	*	14.7 (N=15)	12.7 (N=13)	19.6 (N=20)
Intellectual Development	100 (N=97)	48.5 (N=47)	5.2 (N=5)	*	*	23.7 (N=23)	12.4 (N=12)	10.3 (N=10)
Speech and Language Development	100 (N=147)	7.5 (N=11)	2.7 (N=4)	69.4 (N=102)	0.7 (N=1)	6.1 (N=9)	5.4 (N=8)	8.2 (N=12)
Social/Emotional Development	100 (N=91)	59.3 (N=54)	3.3 (N=3)	1.1 (N=1)	1.1 (N=1)	14.3 (N=13)	15.4 (N=14)	5.5 (N=5)

TABLE 4.37
(Question 18)

Funding Sources Used to Obtain Functional Assessments by Diagnostic Area

Diagnostic Area	Source of Funding							
	Total ** % of Row	Head Start Basic Grant % of Row	Head Start Supplemental (P.A. 26) % of Row	Service Provided In Kind % of Row	Joint Funding (Head Start/ other agency) % of Row	Public Schools (Reimbursement of Services) % of Row	State Funds % of Row	Other 1/ % of Row
Vision	100 (N=35)	42.9 (N=15)	17.1 (N=6)	*	*	2.9 (N=1)	14.3 (N=5)	22.9 (N=8)
Hearing	100 (N=41)	24.4 (N=10)	22.0 (N=9)	2.4 (N=1)	*	*	22.0 (N=9)	29.3 (N=12)
Physical Coordination and Development	100 (N=103)	19.4 (N=20)	19.4 (N=20)	3.9 (N=4)	1.0 (N=1)	4.9 (N=5)	23.3 (N=24)	28.3 (N=29)
Intellectual Development	100 (N=97)	22.7 (N=22)	40.2 (N=39)	2.1 (N=2)	1.0 (N=1)	6.2 (N=6)	15.5 (N=15)	12.4 (N=12)
Speech and Language	100 (N=147)	11.6 (N=17)	41.5 (N=61)	1.4 (N=2)	1.4 (N=2)	7.5 (N=11)	12.9 (N=19)	23.8 (N=35)
Social/ Emotional Development	100 (N=91)	31.9 (N=29)	37.4 (N=34)	4.4 (N=4)	1.1 (N=1)	5.5 (N=5)	7.7 (N=7)	12.1 (N=11)

1/ Includes EPSDT, Head Start/BEH Joint Funding, and other Education for the Handicapped Act Funds

TABLE 4.38
(Question 18)

Frequency of Recommendations Made in the Appropriate Developmental Area by Reported Primary Handicapping Condition

Handicapping Condition and (Appropriate Developmental Area)[1]	Total % of Row	Recommendations Made % of Row	No Reported Recommendations % of Row
Total (Across all Areas)	100.0 (N=269)	82.9 (N=223)	17.1 (N=46)
Visually Impaired (vision)	100.0 (N=15)	73.3 (N=11)	26.7 (N=4)
Blind (vision)	100.0 (N=6)	83.3 (N=5)	16.6 (N=1)
Hearing Impaired (Hearing)	100.0 (N=21)	81.0 (N=17)	19.0 (N=4)
Deaf (Hearing)	100.0 (N=2)	100.0 (N=2)	*
Physical Handicap (Physical Coordination/Development)	100.0 (N=37)	83.8 (N=31)	16.2 (N=6)
Health/Developmentally Impaired (Physical Coordinator/Development)	100.0 (N=30)	73.3 (N=22)	26.7 (N=8)
Speech Impaired (Speech and Language)	100.0 (N=59)	93.2 (N=55)	6.8 (N=4)
Specific Learning Disability (Intellectual Development)	100.0 (N=31)	74.2 (N=23)	25.8 (N=8)
Serious Emotional Disturbance (Social/Emotional Development)	100.0 (N=33)	66.7 (N=22)	33.3 (N=11)
Mentally Retarded (Intellectually or Social/ Emotional Development)	100.0 (N=35)	[2]	[3]

[1] The appropriate developmental area was determined on the basis of OCD Notice A-30-333-4, "Announcement of Diagnostic Criteria for Reporting Handicapped Children in Head Start."

[2] Twenty-six mentally retarded cases received recommendations in intellectual development; 13 mentally retarded children received recommendations in social/ emotional development. Some of the total 35 mentally retarded children received recommendations in both areas. Due to this overlap, it is assumed that all mentally retarded cases received recommendations in an appropriate developmental area.

[3] It is assumed that N=0.

TABLE 4.39
(Question 19)

Frequency of Diagnostic Confirmations Made in the Appropriate Developmental Area by Reported Primary Handicapping Condition

Handicapping Condition and (Appropriate Developmental Area)[1]	Total % of Row	Confirmation Performed % of Row	No Reported Confirmation % of Row
Total	100.0 (N=269)	89.2 (N=240)	10.8 (N=29)
Visually Impaired (Vision)	100.0 (N=15)	93.3 (N=14)	6.7 (N=1)
Blind (Vision)	100.0 (N=6)	83.3 (N=5)	16.7 (N=1)
Hearing Impaired (Hearing)	100.0 (N=21)	95.2 (N=20)	4.8 (N=1)
Deaf (Hearing)	100.0 (N=2)	100.0 (N=2)	*
Physical Handicap (Physical Coordination and Development)	100.0 (N=37)	94.6 (N=35)	5.4 (N=2)
Health/Developmentally Impaired (Physical Coordination and Development)	100.0 (N=30)	80.0 (N=24)	20.0 (N=6)
Speech Impaired (Speech and Language)	100.0 (N=59)	98.3 (N=58)	2.0 (N=1)
Specific Learning Disability (Intellectual Development)	100.0 (N=31)	74.2 (N=23)	25.8 (N=8)
Serious Emotional Disturbance (Social/Emotional Development)	100.0 (N=33)	72.7 (N=24)	27.3 (N=9)
Mentally Retarded (Intellectually or Social/ Emotional Development)	100.0 (N=35)	[2]	

[1] The appropriate developmental area was determined on the basis of OCD Notice A-30-333-4, "Announcement of Diagnostic Criteria for Reporting Handicapped Children in Head Start."

[2] Twenty-seven mentally retarded cases received a confirmation of handicap in intellectual development; 11 mentally retarded children received a confirmation of handicap in social/emotional development. Some of the total 35 mentally retarded cases received a confirmation of handicap in both areas. Due to this overlap, it was considered that all mentally retarded children received a confirmation of handicap in an appropriate developmental area.

TABLE 4.40

AVAILABILITY OF DIAGNOSTIC SERVICES FOR CHILDREN BY HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS (Question 20)

	Yes, Diagnostic Services Available % of all Children (N=269)	No, Professional Diagnostician Not Available % of all Children (N=269)	No, Lack of Money to Pay for Diagnosis % of all Children (N=269)	No, Family Reluctance to Cooperate % of all Children (N=269)	No, Child was Untestable/ Unmanageable % of all Children (N=269)	Other % of all Children (N=268)	Not Known % of all Children (N=268)
Vision confirmation	87.0 (N=234)	0.4 (N=1)	0.7 (N=2)	0.7 (N=2)	1.1 (N=3)	2.6 (N=7)	5.4 (N=14)
assessment	87.4 (N=235)	0.4 (N=1)	0.7 (N=2)	0.7 (N=2)	1.5 (N=4)	3.0 (N=8)	6.3 (N=17)
recommendations	88.1 (N=237)	0.4 (N=1)	0.7 (N=2)	0.7 (N=2)	1.1 (N=3)	2.6 (N=7)	6.3 (N=17)
Hearing confirmation	85.5 (N=230)	1.9 (N=5)	0.7 (N=2)	0.4 (N=1)	1.5 (N=4)	3.7 (N=10)	6.3 (N=17)
assessment	85.1 (N=229)	1.9 (N=5)	0.7 (N=2)	0.4 (N=1)	1.9 (N=5)	3.7 (N=10)	6.3 (N=17)
recommendations	85.5 (N=230)	1.9 (N=5)	0.7 (N=2)	0.4 (N=1)	1.5 (N=4)	3.7 (N=10)	6.3 (N=17)
Physical coordination-confirmation	91.4 (N=246)	1.5 (N=4)	0.4 (N=1)	0.0 (N=0)	0.0 (N=0)	2.6 (N=7)	3.1 (N=11)
assessment	92.2 (N=248)	1.9 (N=5)	0.4 (N=1)	0.0 (N=0)	0.0 (N=0)	1.9 (N=5)	3.7 (N=10)
recommendations	91.8 (N=247)	1.9 (N=5)	0.4 (N=1)	0.0 (N=0)	0.0 (N=0)	2.2 (N=6)	3.7 (N=10)
Intellectual development-confirmation	87.4 (N=235)	2.6 (N=7)	0.4 (N=1)	0.0 (N=0)	0.4 (N=1)	3.7 (N=9)	5.6 (N=15)
assessment	89.5 (N=238)	2.6 (N=7)	0.4 (N=1)	0.0 (N=0)	0.4 (N=4)	2.6 (N=7)	5.0 (N=15)
recommendations	88.5 (N=238)	2.6 (N=7)	0.4 (N=1)	0.0 (N=0)	0.4 (N=1)	2.6 (N=7)	5.6 (N=15)
Speech and Language confirmation	92.2 (N=248)	0.4 (N=1)	0.0 (N=0)	0.0 (N=0)	0.4 (N=1)	3.0 (N=8)	4.1 (N=11)
assessment	93.3 (N=251)	0.4 (N=1)	0.0 (N=0)	0.0 (N=0)	0.4 (N=1)	2.2 (N=6)	3.7 (N=10)
recommendations	93.3 (N=251)	0.4 (N=1)	0.0 (N=0)	0.0 (N=0)	0.4 (N=1)	2.2 (N=6)	3.7 (N=10)
Social/emotional development confirmation	6.7 (N=251)	1.5 (N=4)	0.4 (N=1)	0.4 (N=0)	0.4 (N=1)	3.7 (N=10)	6.7 (N=18)
assessment	88.5 (N=238)	1.5 (N=4)	0.4 (N=1)	0.4 (N=1)	0.4 (N=1)	2.6 (N=7)	6.3 (N=17)
recommendations	88.5 (N=238)	1.5 (N=4)	0.4 (N=1)	0.4 (N=1)	0.4 (N=1)	2.6 (N=7)	6.3 (N=17)

4.43

TABLE 4.41
DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED WITH
DIAGNOSTICIAN'S DEFINITIONS OF
HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS
(Question 21)

Difficulties Encountered	% of Respondents (N=269)
Yes	8.2 (N=20)
No	90.3 (N=245)
Not Indicated	1.5 (N=4)

TABLE 4.42
DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED
WITH DIAGNOSTICIANS DEFINITIONS
BY HANDICAPPING CONDITION
(Question 21)

Handicapping Condition	% of All Cases (N=269)
Blindness	0.0 (N=0)
Visual Impairment	0.0 (N=0)
Deafness	0.0 (N=0)
Hearing Impaired	0.0 (N=0)
Physical Handicap	0.7 (N=2)
Speech Impairment	0.0 (N=0)
Health or Developmental Impairment	1.1 (N=3)
Mental Retardation	0.7 (N=2)
Specific Learning Disabilities	1.5 (N=4)
Serious Emotional Distrubance	3.3 (N=9)
No Difficulty Indicated	92.6 (N=249)

TABLE 4.43
STAFF MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR
DEVELOPING CHILD'S SERVICE PLAN HAS
SEEN THE DIAGNOSTIC FILE
(Question 22)

Staff Member Has Seen File	% of Total (N=269)
Yes	74.0 (N=199)
No, not at all	15.6 (N=42)
No, but the results were given to me by another member of the Head Start staff (*other than to simply confirm child as handicapped*)	9.7 (N=26)
No, but the results were given to me by the diagnostician (*other than to simply confirm child as handicapped*)	0.7 (N=2)

TABLE 4.44
REASON STAFF HAVE NOT SEEN
DIAGNOSTIC FILE
(Question 22a)

Reason Staff Have Not Seen Diagnostic File	% of Total[1/] (N=70)
File maintained in diagnostician's office	14.3 (N=10)
File maintained at program headquarters, but not at this center	64.3 (N=48)
As far as is known, it doesn't exist anywhere	7.1 (N=5)
It's available on site, but the staff has not reviewed it	7.1 (N=5)
Diagnostic files are reviewed by other Head Start staff, although the people involved in planning for this child's services did not see the file	7.1 (N=5)

[1/] Number of staff members reporting they have not seen diagnostic file.

TABLE 4.45
(Question 23)

Cases Where the Parents of Head Start Handicapped Children were Included As Part of a Diagnostic Team	
Parent Inclusion In Diagnostic Team	% of Total
Not reported	0.7 (N=2)
Parents were included as part of the diagnostic team	65.8 (N=177)
Parents were not included as part of the diagnostic team	33.5 (N=90)
Total**	100 (N=269)

TABLE 4.46
(Question 24)

Manner in Which Diagnostic Results Were Explained to Head Start Children's Parents		
Way Explained	% within Group	% of Total by Group
Not Generally Explained	100.0 (N=6)	2.2 (N=6)
Explained by diagnostician:		28.6 (N=77)
method not specified	*	
written report	24.7 (N=19)	
verbal report	48.1 (N=37)	
written and verbal report	27.3 (N=21)	
Explained by Head Start staff:		14.5 (N=39)
method not specified	2.6 (N=1)	
written report	15.4 (N=6)	
verbal report	59.0 (N=23)	
written and verbal report	23.1 (N=9)	
Explained by staff/ diagnostician together:		52.8 (N=142)
method not specified	0.7 (N=1)	
written report	10.6 (N=15)	
verbal report	23.2 (N=33)	
written and verbal report	65.5 (N=93)	
Not reported	100.0 (N=5)	1.9 (N=5)
Total**	N=269	100 (N=269)

TABLE 4.47
(Question 25)

Reason for Use of Agencies/Professionals for Diagnostic Services by Diagnostic Area

Diagnostic Area	Reasons						
	Total [1] % of Row	Least Expensive Service Available % of Row	Best Service Available % of Row	Only Service Available % of Row	Part of Established Diagnostic Service with Which Program is Associated % of Row	No Choice in the Matter Child Was Diagnosed Prior to Enrollment % of Row	Other % of Row
Vision	100 (N=55)	3.6 (N=2)	29.1 (N=16)	*	34.5 (N=19)	16.4 (N=9)	16.4 (N=9)
Hearing	100 (N=61)	3.3 (N=2)	41.0 (N=25)	1.6 (N=1)	26.2 (N=16)	14.8 (N=9)	13.1 (N=8)
Physical Coordination and Development	100 (N=125)	5.6 (N=7)	27.2 (N=34)	0.8 (N=1)	25.6 (N=32)	24.8 (N=31)	16.0 (N=20)
Speech and Language	100 (N=158)	3.2 (N=5)	38.6 (N=61)	6.3 (N=10)	39.2 (N=62)	8.9 (N=14)	3.8 (N=6)
Intellectual Development	100 (N=114)	5.3 (N=6)	36.0 (N=41)	6.1 (N=7)	37.7 (N=43)	10.5 (N=12)	4.4 (N=5)
Social/ Emotional Development	100 (N=107)	4.7 (N=5)	31.8 (N=34)	5.6 (N=6)	41.1 (N=44)	9.3 (N=10)	7.5 (N=8)

1/ Total number of times a diagnosis was conducted in the area specified. Numbers include diagnostic services in primary and secondary areas.

TABLE 4.48

CHILD HAS AN INDIVIDUAL
PLAN OF SERVICES

(Question 26)

Child Has Individual Plan (Question 26)	% of Total Group (N=269)
Yes	69.5 (N=187)
No	29.0 (N=78)
Not Indicated	1.5 (N=4)

TABLE 4.49
SERVICE PLAN IS IN WRITTEN FORM
(Question 26a)

Written Service Plan	% of Total Group (N=187)
Yes	81.8 (N=153)
No	16.6 (N=31)
Not Indicated	1.6 (N=3)

TABLE 4.50
SERVICE PLAN INCLUDES
INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(Question 26b)

Plan Includes Educational Plan	% of Total Group (N=187)
Yes	89.8 (N=169)
No	9.09 (N=17)
Not Indicated	0.53 (N=1)

TABLE 4.51
(Question 27)

Extent of Use of Diagnostic File to Develop Individual Plans of Service[1]	
Frequency of Usage	**% of Total**
Not at All	26.7 (N=50)
Used Slightly	29.9 (N=56)
Used Extensively	41.7 (N=78)
Unspecified	1.6 (N=3)
Total	100.0 (N=187)

[1] Includes only those children for whom an individual plan of service was reported to be available.

TABLE 4.52
(Question 28)

Problems in Using the Diagnostic File to Develop Individual Plans of Service[1]	
Problems	% of Total
No problems	38.0 (N=71)
Other sources were used more	18.2 (N=34)
Out of date information	0.5 (N=1)
Did not receive report in time	9.6 (N=18)
Terminology was too technical	0.5 (N=1)
Staff disagreed on services	0.5 (N=1)
Could not obtain a copy	14.4 (N=27)
Report was too general	5.3 (N=10)
Other	7.5 (N=14)
Unspecified	5.3 (N=10)
Total	100.0 (N=187)

[1] Includes only those children for whom an individual plan of service was reported to be available.

TABLE 4.53
(Question 29)

Manner of Planning Activities By Objective Area

Objective Area	Manner of Planning					
	Row Total % of Row	Planned for all Children the Same Way % of Row	Planned for all Children but Modified for this Child % of Row	Planned because of this Child's Handicapping Condition but not Planned for all Children % of Row	Not Planned for this Child Because of Handicap but Planned for Other Children % of Row	No Response % of Row
Cognitive	100.0 (N=269)	40.5 (N=109)	48.0 (N=129)	9.7 (N=26)	1.1 (N=3)	0.7 (N=2)
Communication	100.0 (N=269)	35.3 (N=95)	44.6 (N=120)	18.6 (N=50)	1.1 (N=3)	0.4 (N=1)
Self Help	100.0 (N=269)	47.2 (N=127)	40.1 (N=108)	11.5 (N=31)	0.7 (N=2)	0.4 (N=1)
Self Concept	100.0 (N=269)	49.4 (N=133)	37.5 (N=101)	11.5 (N=31)	0.4 (N=1)	1.1 (N=3)
Gross Motor	100.0 (N=269)	42.8 (N=115)	43.1 (N=116)	12.6 (N=34)	0.7 (N=2)	0.7 (N=2)
Fine Motor	100.0 (N=269)	42.0 (N=113)	44.2 (N=119)	11.9 (N=32)	0.7 (N=2)	1.1 (N=3)
Other	100.0 (N=269)	3.3 (N=9)	6.3 (N=17)	3.7 (N=10)	0.4 (N=1)	86.2 (N=232)

TABLE 4.54
(Question 30)

Manner of Conducting Activities By Objective Area

Objective Area	Manner of Conducting Classroom Activities					
	Row Total % of Row	Conducted for all Children the Same Way % of Row	Conducted for all Handicapped Children the Same Way % of Row	Specifically Conducted for this Child % of Row	Not Conducted for this Child Because of Handicap But Done for Other Children % of Row	No Response % of Row
Cognitive	100.0 (N=269)	50.9 (N=137)	11.5 (N=31)	36.1 (N=97)	1.1 (N=3)	0.4 (N=1)
Communication	100.0 (N=269)	45.4 (N=122)	10.4 (N=28)	42.8 (N=115)	1.5 (N=4)	*
Self Help	100.0 (N=269)	55.0 (N=148)	10.8 (N=29)	33.8 (N=91)	0.4 (N=1)	*
Self Concept	100.0 (N=269)	57.6 (N=155)	10.8 (N=29)	30.9 (N=83)	0.4 (N=1)	0.4 (N=1)
Gross Motor	100.0 (N=269)	51.7 (N=139)	9.7 (N=26)	37.9 (N=102)	0.7 (N=2)	*
Fine Motor	100.0 (N=269)	50.6 (N=136)	9.7 (N=26)	38.7 (N=104)	0.7 (N=2)	0.4 (N=1)
Other	100.0 (N=269)	4.1 (N=11)	1.1 (N=3)	8.6 (N=23)	0.4 (N=1)	85.9 (N=231)

TABLE 4.55
(Question 31)

Number of Cases Where Specific Written Curricula Were Used	
Specific Curriculum Used	79.6 (N=214)
Specific Curriculum Not Used	18.6 (N=50)
Not Reported	1.8 (N=5)
Total	100.0 (N=269)

TABLE 4.56
(Question 31a)

Written Curricula Used by Objective Area

Objective Area	Curriculum								
	Total ** % of Row	Locally Designed Materials % of Row	Peabody % of Row	Learning Accomplishment Profile (LAP) % of Row	Montessori Curricula % of Row	School Before Six % of Row	Collier Developmental Materials/Rebus Program Curricula % of Row	Other % of Row	Curricula Not Used/ No Response % of Row
Cognitive	100 (N=269)	40.1 (N=108)	8.6 (N=23)	14.5 (N=39)	0.7 (N=2)	0.7 (N=2)	0.7 (N=2)	12.6 (N=34)	21.9 (N=59)
Communication Skills	100 (N=269)	37.2 (N=100)	13.8 (N=37)	13.8 (N=37)	0.7 (N=2)	0.7 (N=2)	0.7 (N=2)	14.9 (N=40)	18.2 (N=49)
Self-help	100 (N=269)	44.2 (N=119)	3.7 (N=10)	14.9 (N=40)	1.9 (N=5)	1.5 (N=4)	0.7 (N=2)	10.0 (N=27)	23.0 (N=62)
Self-concept	100 (N=269)	46.8 (N=126)	5.2 (N=14)	12.3 (N=33)	0.4 (N=1)	0.7 (N=2)	0.7 (N=2)	11.2 (N=30)	22.7 (N=61)
Gross motor	100 (N=269)	41.3 (N=111)	5.2 (N=14)	14.5 (N=39)	0.7 (N=2)	0.7 (N=2)	0.7 (N=2)	14.1 (N=38)	22.7 (N=61)
Fine motor	100 (N=269)	41.3 (N=111)	5.2 (N=14)	14.9 (N=40)	0.7 (N=2)	1.1 (N=3)	0.7 (N=2)	12.3 (N=33)	23.8 (N=64)
Other	100 (N=269)	7.8 (N=21)	0.4 (N=1)	4.1 (N=11)	*	*	0.4 (N=1)	2.2 (N=6)	85.1 (N=229)

TABLE 4.57
(Question 31a)

Performance or Experienced Based Curricula by Objective Area[1/]

Objective Area	Curriculum Orientation			
	Total ** % of Row	Performance Based % of Row	Experience Based % of Row	Mixed % of Row
Cognitive	100 (N-212)	33.0 (N=70)	12.7 (N=27)	54.2 (N=115)
Communication Skills	100 (N=220)	29.5 (N=65)	12.7 (N=28)	57.7 (N=127)
Self-help	100 (N=206)	30.6 (N=63)	15.5 (N=32)	53.9 (N-111)
Self-concept	100 (N=208)	23.6 (N=49)	20.7 (N=43)	55.8 (N=116)
Gross Motor	100 (N=208)	32.2 (N=67)	13.0 (N=27)	54.8 (N=114)
Fine Motor	100 (N=204)	31.4 (N=64)	12.3 (N=25)	56.4 (N=115)

[1/] Includes only those children for whom specific written curricula were used.

TABLE 4.58
CHILD'S PROGRESS IS REGULARLY
MONITORED AGAINST THE
ESTABLISHED OBJECTIVES
(Question 32)

Progress Monitored Against Objectives	% of Total Group (N=269)
Yes	97.8 (N=263)
No	1.5 (N=4)
Not Indicated	0.7 (N=2)

TABLE 4.59
(Question 32a)

Monitoring Techniques Used by Head Start Programs by Frequency of Application

Frequency	Formal (Standardized) Tests % of Column	Assessments That Are Part of Specific Curriculum Package % of Column	Teacher/Center Designed Assessment % of Column	Unstructured Observation % of Column	Parent Report % of Column	Other % of Column
Total[1/]	24.5 (N=66)	34.2 (N=92)	54.6 (N=147)	75.5 (N=203)	47.6 (N=128)	13.8 (N=37)
Weekly	9.1 (N=6)	14.1 (N=13)	19.0 (N=28)	56.2 (N=114)	25.8 (N=33)	18.9 (N=7)
Monthly	*	15.2 (N=14)	17.7 (N=26)	7.9 (N=16)	28.1 (N=36)	37.8 (N=14)
Twice a Year	51.5 (N=34)	25.0 (N=23)	10.9 (N=16)	0.5 (N=1)	20.3 (N=26)	13.5 (N=5)
Yearly	12.1 (N=8)	4.3 (N=4)	2.0 (N=3)	*	*	*
Other	27.3 (N=18)	41.3 (N=38)	50.3 (N=74)	35.2 (N=72)	25.8 (N=33)	29.7 (N=11)

[1/] Percentages in the "total" row are based on a sample size of 269 children and, thus, reflect the percentage of the sample monitored using each technique. All other percentages are based on column-specific totals rather than on the total number of sample children.

TABLE 4.60
CHILD'S INDIVIDUAL PLAN
HAS BEEN CHANGED ON THE
BASIS OF MONITORING
(Question 32b)

Child's Plan Has Been Changed Based on Monitoring	% of Total Group (N=269)
Yes	63.9 (N=172)
No	34.6 (N=93)
Not Indicated	1.5 (N=4)

TABLE 4.61
PROGRAM USES PROFESSIONAL
SPECIALISTS IN PROVIDING SERVICES
FOR YOUR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

(Question 33)

Use of Professional Specialists	% of All Children (N=269)
Yes	90.4 (243)
No	9.3 (N=25)
Not Indicated	0.4 (N=1)

TABLE 4.62
(Question 33a)

Professionals Used for Provision of Services to Study Children and Area of Involvement								
		Involvement Area 2/						
Professional	Total Children Served 1/	Works with Child at Another Site	Works with Child in the Classroom	Trains/Consults with Teacher	Trains Parents	Evaluates Child's Progress	Observes in Classroom	Other
Physician	44.2 (N=119)	76.5 (N=91)	10.9 (N=13)	16.8 (N=20)	14.3 (N=17)	53.8 (N=64)	5.0 (N=6)	7.6 (N=9)
Nurse	51.7 (N=139)	34.5 (N=48)	56.8 (N=79)	66.2 (N=92)	59.0 (N=82)	68.3 (N=95)	53.2 (N=74)	7.9 (N=11)
Psychologist/ Psychiatrist	41.3 (N=111)	42.3 (N=47)	31.5 (N=35)	73.0 (N=81)	36.0 (N=40)	77.5 (N=86)	55.8 (N=62)	5.4 (N=6)
Speech Pathologist/ Therapist	49.4 (N=133)	68.4 (N=91)	50.4 (N=67)	67.7 (N=90)	53.4 (N=71)	88.7 (N=118)	55.6 (N=74)	3.8 (N=5)
Social Worker	40.1 (N=108)	18.5 (N=20)	38.9 (N=42)	63.9 (N=69)	78.7 (N=85)	35.2 (N=38)	54.6 (N=59)	13.0 (N=14)
Nutritionist/ Dietician	12.3 (N=33)	9.1 (N=3)	21.2 (N=7)	100.0 (N=33)	72.7 (N=24)	45.4 (N=15)	45.4 (N=15)	*
Certified Special Education Teacher	22.3 (N=60)	55.0 (N=33)	36.7 (N=22)	65.0 (N=39)	55.0 (N=33)	75.0 (N=45)	61.7 (N=37)	8.3 (N=5)
Physical Therapist	14.9 (N=40)	87.5 (N=35)	27.5 (N=11)	60.0 (N=24)	55.0 (N=22)	62.5 (N=25)	30.0 (N=12)	5.0 (N=2)
Occupational Therapist	8.2 (N=22)	90.9 (N=20)	31.8 (N=7)	68.2 (N=15)	68.2 (N=15)	95.4 (N=21)	27.3 (N=6)	*
Opthamologist/ Optometrist	12.6 (N=34)	91.2 (N=31)	2.9 (N=1)	29.4 (N=10)	29.4 (N=10)	52.9 (N=18)	*	8.8 (N=3)
Other Specialist	23.8 (N=64)	51.6 (N=33)	59.4 (N=38)	71.9 (N=46)	50.0 (N=32)	78.1 (N=50)	68.8 (N=44)	4.7 (N=3)

1/ Percentages for this column based on total number of children in the sample (N=269). For example, 119 children (44.2%) were served by physicians.

2/ Percentages for each row of involvement areas based on number of children served by the corresponding professional type. For example, 91 of the 119 children who were served by a physician, or 76.5 percent, were served at another site.

TABLE 4.63
CHILD IS RECEIVING SERVICES
AS PART OF HIS/HER WEEKLY
SCHEDULE FROM AN AGENCY
OTHER THAN HEAD START

(Question 34)

Child Receives Services From Other Agency	% of All Children (N=269)
Yes	40.9 (N=110)
No	58.7 (N=158)
Not Indicated	0.4 (N=1)

TABLE 4.64
(Question 34a)

Services Provided to Study Children by Agency 1/

Agency	Service Area: Day Care % of Column	Educational Instruction % of Column	Family Counseling % of Column	Medical/ Dental Treatment % of Column	Occupational/ Physical Therapy % of Column	Other Therapy Related to Child's Handicap % of Column	Other % of Column
Total	100.0 (N=5)	100.0 (N=32)	100.0 (N=29)	100.0 (N=25)	100.0 (N=19)	100.0 (N=56)	100.0 (N=16)
Private Practitioner/ Consultant	*	*	10.4 (N=3)	60.0 (N=15)	*	21.4 (N=12)	6.2 (N=1)
Public Hospital	*	*	13.8 (N=4)	16.0 (N=4)	5.3 (N=1)	8.9 (N=5)	*
Public or State Health Department	*	6.2 (N=2)	3.4 (N=1)	*	10.4 (N=2)	1.8 (N=1)	*
Social Services Department	40.0 (N=2)	3.1 (N=1)	31.0 (N=9)	8.0 (N=2)	*	5.4 (N=3)	6.3 (N=1)
Public School System	20.0 (N=1)	62.5 (N=20)	10.4 (N=3)	*	15.8 (N=3)	8.9 (N=5)	50.0 (N=8)
Easter Seal Agency	*	*	3.4 (N=1)	*	5.3 (N=1)	5.4 (N=3)	*
Crippled Children Association	*	*	*	*	31.6 (N=6)	*	*
Association for Retarded Children	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
BEH First Chance Project	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
University Affiliated Facility	*	*	6.9 (N=2)	*	*	7.1 (N=4)	*
Other	40.0 (N=2)	28.2 (N=9)	20.7 (N=6)	16.0 (N=4)	31.6 (N=6)	41.1 (N=23)	37.5 (N=6)

1/ Includes only those children who received services from professionals as part of their weekly schedule (N=110). Each child may have received more than one type of service (i.e., may be represented in more than one column).

TABLE 4.65
(Question 34a)

Services Provided to Study Children by Role of Head Start [1/]

Role of Head Start	Service Area: Day Care % of Column	Educational Instruction % of Column	Family Counseling % of Column	Medical/ Dental Treatment % of Column	Occupational/ Physical Therapy % of Column	Other Therapy Related to Child's Handicap % of Column	Other % of Column
Total	100.0 (N=5)	100.0 (N=32)	100.0 (N=29)	100.0 (N=25)	100.0 (N=19)	100.0 (N=56)	100.0 (N=16)
Services initiated prior to enrollment; no Head Start involvement or coordination	60.0 (N=3)	15.6 (N=5)	20.7 (N=6)	24.0 (N=6)	47.4 (N=9)	12.5 (N=7)	6.2 (N=1)
Services provided at the instigation of Head Start; included in individual plan of services as a line item	20.0 (N=1)	28.1 (N=9)	20.7 (N=6)	24.0 (N=6)	15.8 (N=3)	48.2 (N=27)	37.5 (N=6)
Services provided at the instigation of Head Start; not formally a part of individual plan of services	20.0 (N=1)	15.6 (N=5)	24.1 (N=7)	24.0 (N=6)	*	16.1 (N=9)	37.5 (N=6)
Services provided at the instigation of another agency; coordinated with Head Start and included in individual plan of services	*	12.6 (N=4)	6.9 (N=2)	8.0 (N=2)	15.8 (N=3)	12.5 (N=7)	*
Services provided at the instigation of another agency; but not formally included in individual plan of services	*	3.1 (N=1)	6.9 (N=2)	4.0 (N=1)	15.8 (N=3)	1.8 (N=1)	12.6 (N=2)
Services provided after enrollment, instigated by other agency, and no Head Start involvement/ coordination	*	3.1 (N=1)	3.4 (N=1)	*	*	3.6 (N=2)	*
Other	*	21.9 (N=7)	17.3 (N=5)	16.0 (N=4)	5.2 (N=1)	5.3 (N=3)	6.2 (N=1)

[1/] Includes only those children who received services from professionals as part of their weekly schedule (N=110). Each child may have received more than one type of service (i.e., may be represented in more than one column).

TABLE 4.66
(Question 34a)

Services Provided to Study Children by Source of Funding [1/]

Funding Source	Service Area: Day Care % of Column	Educational Instruction % of Column	Family Counseling % of Column	Medical/ Dental Treatment % of Column	Occupational/ Physical Therapy % of Column	Other Therapy Related to Child's Handicap % of Column	Other % of Column
Total	100.0 (N=5)	100.0 (N=32)	100.0 (N=29)	100.0 (N=25)	100.0 (N=19)	100.0 (N=56)	100.0 (N=16)
Head Start bears full cost	*		13.8 (N=4)	36.0 (N=9)	10.5 (N=2)	28.6 (N=16)	12.5 (N=2)
Services provided in-kind (services not invoiced)	*	3.1 (N=1)	6.9 (N=2)	4.0 (N=1)	5.3 (N=1)	3.6 (N=2)	25.0 (N=4)
Services paid for by providing agency	20.0 (N=1)	68.8 (N=22)	41.4 (N=12)	12.0 (N=3)	31.6 (N=6)	14.3 (N=8)	43.8 (N=7)
Services paid in part by Head Start	20.0 (N=1)	9.4 (N=3)	10.3 (N=3)	*	10.5 (N=2)	3.6 (N=2)	*
Parents pay for services (all or part)	40.0 (N=2)	*	3.4 (N=1)	12.0 (N=3)	5.3 (N=1)	16.0 (N=9)	*
Other	20.0 (N=1)	18.7 (N=6)	24.2 (N=7)	36.0 (N=9)	36.8 (N=7)	33.9 (N=19)	18.7 (N=3)

[1/] Includes only those children who received services from professionals as part of their weekly schedule (N=110). Each child may have received more than one type of service (i.e., may be represented in more than one column).

TABLE 4.67
(Question 35)

Specialist Services Received by Head Start Handicapped Children		
Staffing[1/] and External Services	% of Children	% of Severely/ Profoundly Handicapped Children
Special education staff and receive weekly specialist services	7.8 (N=21)	5.0 (N=4)
Special education staff and do not receive weekly specialist services	2.6 (N=7)	1.2 (N=1)
No special education staff and receive weekly specialist services	33.1 (N=89)	47.5 (N=38)
No special education staff and do not receive weekly specialist services	56.1 (N=131)	46.3 (N=37)
No response	0.4 (N=1)	* (N=0)
Total	100.0 (N=269)	100.0 (N=80)

[1/] Includes classroom teachers and aides and educational coordinators

TABLE 4.68
(Question 36)

Levels of Parental Involvement in Head Start[1/]	
Degree of Involvement	% of Total
Very active	27.1 (N=73)
Average involvement	29.4 (N=79)
Only minor involvement	30.5 (N=82)
Do not participate at all	12.6 (N=34)
No response	0.4 (N=1)
Total	100.0 (N=269)

[1/] As reported by program staff. Data are child-specific.

TABLE 4.69
(Question 37)

Parental Involvement in Development of the Individual Plans of Service[1]	
Ways Parents are Involved	% of Total[2]
No Involvement	10.2 (N=19)
Parent Teaches Child at Home Using Performance Based Criteria	33.7 (N=63)
Parent Teaches Child at Home Using Experience Based Criteria	37.4 (N=70)
Parent is Kept Informed of Progress in Classroom	81.3 (N=152)
Parent Involved in Classroom Activities	38.0 (N=71)
Parent Assists in Evaluation of Child's Progress	48.1 (N=90)
Parent Designs Activities	17.1 (N=32)
Parent Approves Individual Plan	52.9 (N=99)
Parent Helps Design Individual Plan	15.5 (N=29)
Other	4.3 (N=8)

[1] Includes only those children with an individual plan of services (N=187).

[2] Percentages are based on the sample of children with an individual plan of services. Parents may have been involved in more than one manner.

TABLE 4.70
(Question 38)

General Program Activities in Which Head Start Parents Were Involved	
Activity	% of Children's Parents Involved 1/
Provide transportation	40.1 (N=108)
Train/counsel other parents	10.0 (N=27)
Involvement in outreach/recruitment	9.7 (N=26)
Develop community resource file	3.7 (N=10)
Develop objectives for social service/ parent involvement activities	15.2 (N=41)
Liaison between Head Start and other agency	13.0 (N=35)
Make/donate materials for classroom	49.0 (N=132)
Involvement in functions with other Head Start parents	66.5 (N=179)
Other	14.9 (N=40)

1/ Percentages are based on the sample of 269 handicapped children.

TABLE 4.71
(Question 39)

Training Received by Head Start Parents by Provider of Training[1/]

Provider of Training	Training Types										
	Assessment % of Column	Program Goals and Objectives % of Column	Normal Child Growth and Development % of Column	Identifying Special Needs of Their Child % of Column	Educational Planning % of Column	Availability of Other Community Resources % of Column	Legal Rights Related to Their Child % of Column	Genetic Counseling % of Column	Emergency First Aid % of Column	Information Concerning Their Child's Specific Handicap % of Column	Other % of Column
Total	N=70	N=271	N=118	N=155	N=85	N=140	N=72	N=20	N=54	N=245	N=25
Local Head Start Staff	19.0 (N=51)	49.4 (N=133)	30.1 (N=81)	37.2 (N=100)	26.4 (N=71)	44.6 (N=120)	18.6 (N=50)	0.7 (N=2)	13.8 (N=37)	46.1 (N=124)	4.8 (N=13)
Other Professionals	7.1 (N=19)	11.2 (N=30)	11.9 (N=32)	17.1 (N=46)	4.1 (N=11)	6.7 (N=18)	6.7 (N=18)	5.2 (N=14)	4.5 (N=12)	37.5 (N=101)	3.7 (N=10)
Regional/State Head Start Staff	*	1.5 (N=4)	0.7 (N=2)	0.7 (N=2)	0.4 (N=1)	0.4 (N=1)	*	*	0.7 (N=2)	1.1 (N=3)	0.4 (N=1)
Others	*	1.5 (N=4)	1.1 (N=3)	2.6 (N=7)	0.7 (N=2	0.4 (N=1)	1.5 (N=4)	1.5 (N=4)	1.1 (N=3)	6.3 (N=17)	0.4 (N=1)

1/Data are child-specific.

Note: Percentages were derived from total number of children (269). Since parents may receive the same type of training from different providers the total N may represent duplicated cases.

TABLE 4.72
PROGRAM WOULD LIKE TO
MAKE OTHER SERVICES AVAILABLE
BUT RESOURCES ARE NOT
AVAILABLE

(Question 40)

Would Like to Provide Other Services	% of All Children (N=269)
Yes	49.8 (N=134)
No	44.2 (N=119)
Not Indicated	5.9 (N=16)

TABLE 4.73
SERVICES PROGRAM WOULD LIKE
TO MAKE AVAILABLE TO CHILD
OR HIS/HER FAMILY FOR WHICH
RESOURCES WERE NOT AVAILABLE

(Question 40A)

Services	Total Frequency (N=134)
Education/Training of Staff (first aid, special education)	47
Education/Training of Parents (Counseling)	71
Special Equipment	31
Special Services (transport, theraphy, Individual Instruction)	53
Additional Staff	28
Follow Through with Additional Education/ Medical Attention	26
Information on Other Community Resources	5
Other	28

PHASE I

DIAGNOSTICIAN/PROFESSIONAL
SERVICE PROVIDER SCHEDULE
PART A: INDIVIDUAL'S CHARACTERISTICS

Form 07

TABLE 7.1
TYPES OF DIAGNOSTICIAN/SERVICE PROVIDERS
(Question 1)

Diagnostician/Service Providers	% of Diagnosticians/ Service Providers (n=265) 1/
Psychologist/Psychiatrist	15.1 (N=40)
Pediatrician	10.9 (N=29)
Other Physician	9.1 (N=24)
Registered Nurse	3.0 (N=8)
Speech Therapist/Pathologist	24.5 (N=65)
Audiologist	2.6 (N=7)
Optometrist/Opthalmologist	3.8 (N=10)
Physical Therapist	2.6 (N=7)
Occupational Therapist	1.9 (N=5)
Nutritionist/Dietrician	0.0**
Certified Special Education Teacher	3.8 (N=10)
Social Worker	3.0 (N=8)
Public Health Nurse	2.6 (N=7)
Other	15.8 (N=42)
Not Specified	1.1 (N=3)

1/ Number of diagnosticians/service providers interviewed.

TABLE 7.2

AGENCY AFFILIATION OF
DIAGNOSTICIAN/SERVICE PROVIDER

(Question 2)

Agency Affiliation	% of Diagnosticians/ Service Providers (n=265)1/
None-private practitioner/consultant	20.0 (N=53)
Public hospital	4.5 (N=12)
Public school system	9.8 (N=29)
Local social services department	1.5 (N=4)
State social services department	0.4 (N=1)
Easter Seal agency	2.3 (N=6)
BEH First Chance Project	**
State institution	4.9 (N=13)
Other BEH project	0.4 (N=1)
Other private medical clinic	9.1 (N=24)
Other private program for the handicapped	1.9 (N=5)
State or Regional Head Start staff	4.5 (N=12)
Other	38.5 (N=102)
Not specified	1.1 (N=3)

1/ Number of diagnosticians/service providers interviewed.

TABLE 7.3

DIAGNOSTICIAN/SERVICE PROVIDER
IS PAID FOR SERVICES

(Question 3)

Paid for Services	% of Diagnostician/ Service Providers (n=265)1/
Yes	70.6 (N=187)
No	25.3 (N=67)
Not specified	4.2 (N=11)

1/ Number of diagnosticians/service providers interviewed.

TABLE 7.4

AGENCY PAYING DIAGNOSTICIAN/SERVICE PROVIDER

(Question 3a)

Agency	Total Number (n=187) 1/
Head Start entirely	30.2 (N=80)
Agency/institution with which affiliated	17.0 (N=45)
Head Start/other agency (joint funding)	7.2 (N=19)
Other	14.0 (N=37)
Not Specified	2.3 (N=6)

1/ Number of professionals paid for services.

TABLE 7.5

SOURCE OF FUNDS

(Question 3b)

Source of Funds	% of Professionals Paid for Services (N=187)1/
Local Funds	3.7 (N=7)
State Funds	25.7 (N=48)
Federal Funds From:	
• BEH	**
• EPSDT	0.5 (N=1)
• Other	18.7 (N=35)
Don't Know	51.3 (N=96)

1/ Number of professionals paid for services

PHASE I

DIAGNOSTICIAN/PROFESSIONAL

SERVICE PROVIDER SCHEDULE

PART B: CHILD SPECIFIC DATA

Form 08

TABLE 8.1

SPECIFIC SERVICES
PROVIDED TO CHILD

(Question 1)

Service	% of Service Providers (n=467)1/
Diagnosis	54.0 (n=252)
Screening	51.6 (n=241)
Therapy (Occupational, Physical, Speech, etc.)	23.8 (n=111)
Health Services (medical)	21.4 (n=100)
Educational Services	22.3 (n=104)
Parental Counseling/Training	42.6 (n=199)
Teacher/Staff Training Specific to Child	39.0 (n=182)
Other	6.2 (n=29)

1/ Some Diagnostician/Service Providers completed this questionnaire for more than one child

TABLE 8.2

DIAGNOSTIC PROCESSES
SERVICE PROVIDER PARTICIPATED IN

(Question 2)

Diagnostic Process	% of Service Providers (n=467)
Confirmation of Handicap	45.6 (n=213)
Functional Assessment In Area Of Handicap	39.8 (n=186)
General Functional Assessment	23.6 (n=110)
Recommendations In Area of Handicap	42.2 (n=197)
General Recommendations	30.4 (n=142)

TABLE 8.3

DIAGNOSIS YOU MADE OF CHILD

(Question 3)

Diagnosis	% of Service Providers (n=467)
Blind	0.6 (n=3)
Visual Impairment	2.6 (n=12)
Deaf	0.4 (n=2)
Hearing Impaired	6.0 (n=28)
Physically Handicapped	5.1 (n=24)
Speech Impaired	19.1 (n=89)
Health or Developmentally Impaired	9.0 (n=42)
Mentally Retarded	10.1 (n=47)
Serious Emotional Disturbance	5.4 (n=25)
Specific Learning Disability	6.0 (n=28)

TABLE 8.4

TECHNIQUES USED IN DIAGNOSIS

(Question 4)

Techniques Used	% of Service Providers (n=467)
Physical Exam (includes laboratory tests, EKG, etc.)	13.5 (n=63)
Observation (structured/unstructured)	13.3 (n=62)
Locally Designed Instruments	3.6 (n=17)
Formal (Standardized) Tests	61.2 (n=286)
Full or Partial Audiological Exam	17.1 (n=80)
Full or Partial Opthamological Exam	4.7 (n=22)
Function Reports (Case History, parent, social workers, etc.)	5.8 (n=27)
Other	7.7 (n=36)

TABLE 8.5

FUNCTIONAL ASSESSMENT

(Question 4)

Functional Assessment	% of Service Providers (n=467)
Formal Standardized Tests	17.1 (n=80
Curriculum Package Assessments	3.0 (n=14
Teacher/Center Designed Assessment	6.9 (n=32)
Unstructured Observation	24.2 (n=113)
Parent Report	14.1 (n=66)
Same as "Confirmation of Handicap"	36.2 (n=169)
Other	5.6 (n=26)

TABLE 8.6

RECOMMENDATIONS

(Questions 4, 5)

Report Form (Question 4)	% of Service Providers (n=467)
Written Report	26.3 (n=123)
Verbal Report	3.0 (n=14)
Other	23.1 (n=108)
Report Discussed With: (Question 5)	
Parents	41.5 (n=194)
Child's teacher	32.5 (n=152
Program Coordinator	16.5 (n=77)
Head Start Director	16.5 (n=77)
Other	24.4 (n=114)

TABLE 8.7

MEMBER OF DIAGNOSTIC
TEAM FOR CHILD

(Question 6)

Member of Diagnostic Team for Child	% of Service Providers (n=467)
Yes	40.0 (n=187)
No	60.0 (n=280)

TABLE 8.8

HOW DIAGNOSTICIAN/SERVICE PROVIDER BECAME INVOLVED
WITH THE HEAD START PROGRAM
DIAGNOSIS OF CHILD

(Question 7)

How Diagnostician/Services Provider Became Involved	% of Total (N=265)[1/]
Through children only-not regularly involved with Head Start	13.6 (n=36)
Sought out by Head Start for his/her services on an "as needed" basis	52.8 (n=140)
Referred to Head Start by other agency	4.5 (n=12)
EPSDT	**
Part of regular Head Start diagnostic staff	22.6 (n=60)
Other	11.3 (n=30)

[1/] Number of diagnostician/service providers in sample. Some diagnosticians completed form for more than one child.

TABLE 8.9
(Question 8)

Techniques Used By Diagnosticians
For Screening in Vision

Technique Type	% of Total (n = 73) 1/
Snellen Picture Chart	35.6 (n=26)
Opthamological Exam	21.9 (n=16)
Titmus	6.8 (n=5)
Sojourn Hand Test	2.7 (n=2)
Other formal (standardized) test	9.6 (n=7)
Observation	12.3 (n=9)
Locally designed instrument	1.4 (n=1)
Other	5.5 (n=4)
Don't know	4.1 (n=3)

1/ Number of instances diagnosticians provided screening for vision.

TABLE 8.10
(Question 8)

Techniques Used by Diagnosticians
For Screening in Hearing

Technique Type	% of Total (n = 99) [1]
Pure Tone Sweep	6.1 (n=6)
Pure Tone Threshold	12.1 (n=12)
Impedence	7.1 (n=7)
Speech Reception Threshold/Speech Discrimination	**
Audiometric Exam-Technique not specified	41.4 (n=41)
Full Audiometric Exam (2 or more of the above Techniques)	3.0 (n=3)
Observation	9.1 (n=9)
Other formal (standardized) test	5.1 (n=5)
Don't know	13.1 (n=13)

[1] Number of instances diagnosticians provided screening for hearing.

TABLE 8.11
(Question 8)

Techniques Used by Diagnosticians For Screening in Physical Coordination and Development

Technique Type	% of Total (n=129) 1/
Physical exam	19.4 (n=25)
Learning Accomplishment Profile	**
Denver Developmental Screening Test	12.4 (n=16)
Cattel Infant Intelligence Test	**
Bayley Scales of Infant Development	0.8 (n=1)
Other formal (standardized) test	19.4 (n=25)
Observation	28.7 (n=37)
Locally designed assessment	13.2 (n=17)
Don't know	6.2 (n=8)

1/ Number of instances diagnostician provided screening in physical coordination and development.

TABLE 8.12

(Question 8)

Techniques Used by Diagnosticians for Screening in Speech and Language Development

Technique Type	% of Total (n=208) 1/
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	9.1 (n=19)
Goldman Fristoe Test of Atticulation	6.7 (n=14)
Carrow Test for Auditory Comprehension of Language	5.8 (n=12)
Zimmerman Pre-school Language Test	1.0 (n=2)
Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities	0.5 (n=1)
Other formal(standardized) test	34.1 (n=71)
Observation	25.5 (n=53)
Locally designed assessment	6.7 (n=14)
Don't know	10.6 (n=22)

1/ Number of instances diagnosticians provided screening in speech and language development.

TABLE 8.13

(Question 8)

Techniques Used by Diagnosticians for Screening in Intellectual Development

Technique Type	% of Total (n=108) 1/
Denver Developmental Screening Test	5.6 (n=6)
Stanford-Binet	15.7 (n=17)
Cattell Infant Intelligence Test	**
Learning Accomplishment Profile	0.9 (n=1)
Bayley Scales of Infant Development	**
Other formal (standardized) test	29.6 (n=32)
Observation	35.2 (n=38)
Locally designed assessment	10.2 (n=11)
Don't know	2.8 (n=3)

1/ Number of instances diagnostician provided screening in intellectual development.

TABLE 8.14
(Question 8)

Techniques Used by Diagnosticians for Screening in Social Emotional Development	
Technique Type	% of Total (n=215) 1/
Denver Developmental Screening Test	7.9 (n=17)
Vineland Social Maturity Scale	6.5 (n=14)
Bayley Scales of Infant Development	**
Learning Accomplishment Profile	0.5 (n=1)
Other formal (standardized) test	9.8 (n=21)
Observation	49.8 (n=107)
Locally designed assessment	14.4 (n=31)
Other	9.3 (n=20)
Don't know	1.9 (n=4)

1/ Number of instances diagnostician provided screening in social emotional development.

TABLE 8.15

HOW DIAGNOSTICIAN/SERVICE PROVIDER BECAME INVOLVED WITH THE HEAD START PROGRAM SCREENING OF CHILD

(Question 9)

How Diagnostician/Service Provider Became Involved	% of Service Providers (n=265) 1/
Through children only - not regularly involved with Head Start	6.0 (n=16)
Sought out by Head Start for his/her services on an "as needed" basis	46.4 (n=123)
Referred to Head Start by other agency	6.4 (n=17)
EPSDT	**
Part of regular Head Start Screening staff	27.9 (n=74)
Other	10.2 (n=27
Not Indicated	3.0 (n=8)

1/ Number of service providers in sample.

TABLE 8.16

SPECIAL THERAPEUTIC SERVICES
PROVIDED TO CHILD

(Question 10)

Therapeutic Services	% of Total (n=215) 1/
Physical/Orthopedic	7.9 (n=17)
Occupational	6.5 (n=14)
Speech and Language	**
Psychological/Neurological	0.5 (n=1)
Developmental	9.8 (n=21)
Play Therapy	49.8 (n=107)
Behavior Modification	14.4 (n=31)
Recreational	9.3 (n=20
Other	1.9 (n=4)

1/ Number of instances of provision of therapeutic services.

TABLE 8.17

HOW DIAGNOSTICIAN/SERVICE PROVIDER BECAME INVOLVED WITH HEAD START PROGRAM THERAPY FOR CHILD

(Question 11)

How Diagnostician/Service Provider Became Involved	% of Total (n=119) [1]
Service Predate Child's Head Start Enrollment	16.8 (n=20)
Sought Out Head Start	31.1 (n=37)
Sought Out By Parents/Other Agency After Child's Enrollment in Head Start, but Coordinate With Head Start	8.4 (n=10)
Sought Out by Parents/Other Agency After Child's Enrollment in Head Start, and no Coordination with Head Start	0.8 (n=1)
Part of Regular Head Start Handicapped Effort	29.4 (n=35)
Other	13.4 (n=16)

[1] Number of instances in which this question was answered.

TABLE 8.18

SPECIAL HEALTH SERVICES
PROVIDED TO CHILD

(Question 12)

Health Services	% of Total (n=217) 1/
Regular medical/dental examinations and Follow-up	32.3 (n=70)
Prescription and monitoring of pharmaceuticals	18.4 (n=40)
Surgical Services (Specific to Handicap)	8.3 (n=18)
Nutritional planning and monitoring	14.3 (n=31)
Treatment of allergies and handicap-related syndromes	5.1 (n=11)
Prosthetic services	1.4 (n=3)
Other	20.3 (n=44)

1/ Number of instances health services were provided.

TABLE 8.19

HOW DIAGNOSTICIAN/SERVICE PROVIDER BECAME INVOLVED WITH HEAD START PROGRAM HEALTH SERVICES

(Question 13)

How Diagnostician/Service Provider Became Involved	% of Total (n=113)
Services Predate Child's Head Start Enrollment	23.0 (n=26)
Sought Out by Head Start	34.5 (n=39)
Sought Out by Parents/Other Agency After Child's Enrollment in Head Start, but Coordinate with Head Start	9.7 (n=11)
Sought Out by Parents/Other Agency After Child's Enrollment in Head Start, and no Coordination with Head Start	5.3 (n=6)
Part of Regualr Head Start Handicapped Effort	12.4 (n=14)
Other	15.0 (n=17)

1/ Number of instances in which this question was answered.

TABLE 8.20

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES PROVIDED
TO CHILD

(Question 14)

Educational Services	% of Total (n=270) 1/
Developed Educational objectives/program	31.9 (n=86)
Worked with child at Head Start Center	21.5 (n=58)
Worked with child at home or location other than Head Start Center	11.9 (n=32)
Conducted educational assessments on child	19.3 (n=52)
Other	15.6 (n=42)

1/ Number of instances educational services were provided.

TABLE 8.21

SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENTAL AREA IN
WHICH CHILDREN RECEIVED EDUCATION SERVICES

(Question 15)

Developmental Areas	% of Total (n=270) 1/
Cognitive	28.5 (n=77)
Communication Skills	24.8 (n=67)
Self-help skills	19.3 (n=52)
Self-concept skills	24.8 (n=67)
Gross motor skills	22.2 (n=60)
Fine motor skills	25.9 (n=70)
Behavior management	22.2 (n=60)
Other	7.0 (n=19)

1/ Number of instances educational services were provided.

TABLE 8.22

HOURS SERVICE PROVIDER WORKED WITH CHILD

(Question 16)

Hours Per Week	% of Total (n=89) [1]
1-3	50.6 (n=45)
4-8	2.2 (n=2)
9-12	2.2 (n=2)
Over 12	2.2 (n=2)
Other (e.g., once a month, etc.)	42.7 (n=38)

[1] Number of instances service provider worked with child.

TABLE 8.23

HOW SERVICE PROVIDER BECAME INVOLVED
WITH HEAD START PROGRAM EDUCATION SERVICES

(Question 17)

How Service Provider Became Involved	% of Total (n=122) 1/
Services Predate Child's Head Start Enrollment	22.1 (n=27)
Sought Out by Head Start	35.2 (n=43)
Sought Out by Parents/Other Agency After Child's Enrollment in Head Start, but Coordinate with Head Start	1.6 (n=2)
Sought Out by Parents/Other Agency After Child's Enrollment in Head Start, and no Coordination with Head Start	**
Part of Regular Head Start Handicapped Effort	29.5 (n=36)
Other	11.5 (n=14)

1/ Number of instances in which this question was answered.

TABLE 8.24

SPECIFIC COUNSELING/TRAINING SERVICES
PROVIDED TO PARENTS/GUARDIANS OF CHILDREN

(Question 18)

Counseling/Training Services	% of Total (n=265) 1/
Interpretation of diagnostic file	54.7 (n=145)
Nutritional/health counseling	20.0 (n=53)
Behavior Management	39.2 (n=104)
Family Relations	35.8 (n=95)
Availability of Other Community Resources	37.4 (n=99)
Instructional techniques	37.4 (n=99)
Other	8.7 (n=23)

1/ Number of service providers. Respondents could select more than one option.

TABLE 8.25

HOW SERVICE PROVIDER
BECAME INVOLVED WITH HEAD START PROGRAM
IN PARENTAL COUNSELING/TRAINING

(Question 19)

How Service Provider Became Involved	% of Total (n=215) [1]
Services Predate Child's Head Start Enrollment	17.2 (n=37)
Sought Out by Head Start	32.1 (n=69)
Sought Out by Parents/Other Agency After Child's Enrollment in Head Start, but Coordinates with Head Start	5.6 (n=12)
Sought Out by Parents/Other Agency After Child's Enrollment in Head Start, and no Coordination with Head Start	4.2 (n=9)
Part of Regular Head Start Handicapped Effort	27.9 (n=60)
Other	13.0 (n=28)

[1] Number of instances in which this question was answered.

TABLE 8.26

SPECIFIC TRAINING SERVICES
PROVIDED TO HEAD START STAFF

(Question 20)

Training Services	% of Service Providers (n=265) [1]
Knowledge of Head Start performance standards	13.6 (n=36)
Behavior Management/Modifications	36.6 (n=97)
Individualized instructional techniques	48.3 (n=128)
Preparation of individual learning objectives	31.7 (n=84)
Working with parents	37.4 (n=99)
Strategies for recruitment of handicapped children	14.7 (n=39)
Screening and assessment	42.3 (n=112)
Theory and Practice of Mainstreaming	15.1 (n=40)

[1] Number of service providers. Respondents could indicate more than one option.

TABLE 8.27

HOW SERVICE PROVIDER BECAME INVOLVED IN THE HEAD START PROGRAM STAFF TRAINING

(Question 21)

How Service Provider Became Involved in Staff Training	% of Service Providers (n=185) 1/
Services sought by local Head Start Program	63.8 (n=118)
Services provided through regional Head Start Staff	**
Other	36.2 (n=67)

1/ Number of service providers involved in staff training.

PHASE I

NON-ENROLLED CHILD
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Form 09

TABLE 9.1
ACTUAL OR SUSPECTED
HANDICAP OF NON-ENROLLED
CHILD
(Question 1)

Handicap	Number of Children (N=13)
Don't know	2
Blind	*
Visual impairment	*
Deaf	*
Hearing impairment	*
Physical handicap	1
Health impaired	2
Speech impaired	5
Mental retardation	*
Serious emotional disturbance	1
Specific learning disability	*
Multiple handicapped	2

TABLE 9.2
WHO REFERED NON-ENROLLED
CHILD TO PROGRAM
(Question 1)

Refered By	Number of Children (N=13)
Friends	3
Came to Head Start on own	3
Public schools	*
Social worker/social service agency	3
Church	*
Physician	1
Public health nurse	*
BEH project	*
EPSDT project	*
Other specialist	1
Other public agency	*
Other private agency	*
Other	2

TABLE 9.3
REASON CHILD WAS NOT
ABLE TO ENTER PROGRAM
(Question 2)

Reason	Number of Children (N=13)
Did not meet income guidelines	3
No available openings	5
Lack of appropriate staff training	*
Lack of suitable facilities or equipment	*
Other agencies serve these children	1
Concern over possible legal liabilities	*
Behavioral problems	*
Handicap too severe for child to benefit from Head Start	*
Felt child's attendance would be detrimental to other children	*
Child's parents refused	*
Other parents or parent advisory group objected	*
Lack of adaquate transportation	*
Other	6

TABLE 9.4
HEAD START CONFIRMATION
OF REASON CHILD COULD
NOT ENTER REASON
(Question 2a)

Confirmed	Number of Children (N=13)
Confirmed	5
Disagreement	*
Not known	8

TABLE 9.5
CHILD IS IN ANOTHER PROGRAM
(Question 5)

Child is in Another Program	Number of Children (N=13)
Yes	5
No	8

TABLE 9.6
PROGRAM CHILD IS ENROLLED IN
(Question 3)

Program	Number of Children (N=5) 1/
Easter Seal program	*
Public school program	1
Church-sponsored program	*
BEH First Chance Project	*
Other	4

1/ Number of children enrolled in another program

TABLE 9.7
CHILD IS RECEIVING SERVICES
AS A RESULT OF HIS/HER
HANDICAP
(Question 4)

Child is Receiving Services	Number of Children (N=13)
Yes	6
No	7

TABLE 9.8
KIND OF SERVICES
CHILD RECEIVES
(Question 4)

Kind of Services Child Receives	Number of Children
Day care	1
Educational instruction	1
Family counseling	1
Medical/dental treatment	5
Occupational/physical therapy	2
Other therapy related to handicap	3
Other service	*

TABLE 9.9
SERVICES WERE ARRANGED
THROUGH, OR AS A RESULT
OF, CONTACT WITH
HEAD START
(Question 5)

Services Arranged Through Head Start	Number of Children
Yes	5
No	2

TABLE 9.10
CHILD'S PROGRAM
IS CATEGORICAL OR
NON-CATAGORICAL
(Question 5)

Child's Program's Categorical or Non-Categorical	Number of Children (N=5) 1/
Categorical	1
Non-categorical	4

1/ Number of children enrolled in another program.

PHASE I

ALTERNATE PROGRAM SCHEDULE

Form 10

TABLE 10.1

LENGTH OF TIME NON-HEAD START PROGRAM HAS BEEN SERVING HANDICAPPED PRESCHOOLERS

(Question 1)

Length of Time	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
Less than one year	2.2 (n=1)
1-2 years	13.0 (n=6)
3-4 years	15.2 (n=7)
5-7 years	15.2 (n=7)
8-10	13.0 (n=6)
Over 10 years	41.3 (n=19)

TABLE 10.2

NON-SERVED PROGRAM SERVES
NON-HANDICAPPED PRESCHOOLERS

(Question 2)

Program Serves Non-Handicapped	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
Yes	21.7 (n=10)
No	78.3 (n=36)

TABLE 10.3

NON-HEAD START PROGRAM
IS CATEGORICAL OR
NON-CATEGORICAL

(Question 3)

Program Type	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
Categorical	47.8 (n=22)
Non-Categorical	50.0 (n=23)
Not Indicated	2.2 (n=1)

TABLE 10.4

SPECIFIC TYPES OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN SERVED BY NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS

(Question 3a)

Handicapping Condition	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
Blindness	32.6 (n=15)
Visual Impairment	47.8 (n=22)
Deafness	30.4 (n=14)
Hearing Impairment	50.0 (n=23)
Physical Handicap	71.7 (n=33)
Speech Impairment	69.6 (n=32)
Health or Developmental Impairment	58.7 (n=27)
Mental Retardation	80.4 (n=37)
Serious Emotional Disturbance	55.6 (n=26)
Specific Learning Disabilities	47.8 (n=22)
Other	17.4 (n=8)

TABLE 10.5

NUMBER OF PRESCHOOL CHILDREN
ENROLLED IN NON-HEAD START
PROGRAMS

(Question 4)

Number of Children	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
Not Indicated	17.4 (n=8)
1-5	58.7 (n=27)
6-10	15.2 (n=7)
11-30	4.3 (n=2)
31-50	4.3 (n=2)

TABLE 10.6

NUMBER OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN ENROLLED IN NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS

(Question 4a)

Number of Children	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
Not Indicated	17.4 (n=8)
1-5	54.3 (n=25)
6-10	17.4 (n=8)
11-30	10.9 (n=5)

TABLE 10.7

AVAILABILITY OF MAINSTREAMING
IN NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS

(Question 5)

Mainstreaming is Provided	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
Yes	28.3 (n=13)
Yes, but only for non-classroom activities	8.7 (n=4)
No	58.7 (n=27)
Not Indicated	4.3 (n=2)

TABLE 10.8

TYPES OF MAINSTREAMING
AVAILABLE IN NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS

(Question 5a)

Type of Mainstreaming	% of Non-Head Start Programs [1] Offering Mainstreaming (n=13)
Complete mainstreaming of handicapped child into a regular classroom (no supportive services provided)	46.1 (n=6)
Complete mainstreaming of handicapped child into a regular classroom with supportive assistances provided by a specialist	100.0 (n=13)
Complete mainstreaming of handicapped children in a classroom where the regular classroom teacher and a special education teacher cooperatively work with all children (a team arrangement)	23.1 (n=3)
Reverse mainstreaming in which normal children become part of a special education class	38.5 (n=5)
Partial mainstreaming where handicapped children are in a special education class but to to main-streamed classes for one or more regular activities	38.5 (n=5)

[1] Programs could select more than one option.

TABLE 10.9

APPROXIMATE PERCENTAGE OF TIME CHILDREN SPEND
IN A MAINSTREAMED ENVIRONMENT IN NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS

(Question 5b)

Percentage of Time Mainstreamed	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46) 1/
2	2.2 (n=1)
20	2.2 (n=1)
25	2.2 (n=1)
30	2.2 (n=1)
50	2.2 (n=1)
60	2.2 (n=1)
70	2.2 (n=1)
80	2.2 (n=1)
85	2.2 (n=1)
95	2.2 (n=1)
100	13.0 (n=6)

1/ Includes 13 programs that mainstream for non-class activities. One program did not respond to question.

TABLE 10.10

NUMBER OF FULL TIME TEACHERS IN CLASSROOM
IN NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS

(Question 6)

Average Number of Teachers (Full Time)	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
1	58.7 (n=27)
2	17.4 (n=8)
3	4.3 (n=2)
4	8.7 (n=4)
7	2.2 (n=1)
8	2.2 (n=1)
Not Specified	6.5 (n=3)

TABLE 10.11

TOTAL MEMBERS OF INSTRUCTIONAL TEAM IN NON-HEAD START PROGRAM CLASSROOMS

(Question 6)

Average Number of Instructional Team Members	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
1	4.3 (n=2)
2	6.5 (n=3)
3	19.6 (n=9)
4	4.3 (n=2)
5	4.3 (n=2)
6	2.2 (n=1)
8	2.2 (n=1)
10	2.2 (n=1)
25	2.2 (n=1)
Not Specified	52.2 (n=24)

TABLE 10.12

TYPICAL NUMBER OF OTHER
ADULTS IN NON-HEAD START CLASSROOM

(Question 6a)

Average Number of Other Adults in Classroom	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
1	34.8 (n=16)
2	26.1 (n=12)
3	8.7 (n=4)
4	4.3 (n=2)
5	4.3 (n=2)
7	2.2 (n=1)
9	2.2 (n=1)
Not Specified	17.4 (n=8)

TABLE 10.13

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN
NON-HEAD START CLASSROOMS
IN WHICH THERE IS AT LEAST ONE HANDICAPPED CHILD

(Question 6b)

Average Number of Children in Classroom	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
Up to 10	47.8 (n=22)
11-20	30.4 (n=14)
21-30	10.9 (n=5)
Over 30	2.2 (n=1)
Not Specified	8.7 (n=4)

TABLE 10.14

(Question 7)

Educational Level of Non-Head Start Staff by Staff Position

Staff Position	Highest Educational Level Obtained					
	Total[1/] % of Row	Less than High School % of Row	High School Graduates % of Row	Associate degree/ some college % of Row	College Graduate % of Row	Postgraduate Education % of Row
Teachers	100.0 (N=191)	2.1 (N=4)	5.2 (N=10)	8.4 (N=16)	59.2 (N=113)	25.1 (N=48)
Aides	100.0 (N=170)	7.0 (N=12)	53.5 (N=91)	24.7 (N=42)	12.4 (N=21)	2.4 (N=4)

10.15

[1/] Row totals represent the total number of staff of that position within the program who provided services to one or more handicapped children. Data are staff-specific.

TABLE 10.15

(Question 7b)

Non-Head Start Program Staff Levels by Degree Area[1/]

Degree Area	Staff Level		
Number of Staff for a Typical Classroom	Classroom Teacher % of Column	Aide % of Column	Other % of Column
Total	100.0 (N=56)	100.0 (N=9)	100.0 (N=7)
Special Education			
1 Staff	17.9 (N=10)	11.1 (N=1)	14.3 (N=1)
2 or More Staff	26.8 (N=15)	*	*
Early Childhood Development			
1 Staff	12.5 (N=7)	11.1 (N=1)	14.3 (N=1)
2 or More Staff	8.9 (N=5)	*	*
Other			
1 Staff	12.5 (N=7)	22.2 (N=2)	57.1 (N=4)
2 or More Staff	21.4 (N=12)	55.6 (N=5)	14.3 (N=1)

[1/] Data are staff-specific

TABLE 10.16

(Question 7c)

Non-Head Start Program Staff Levels by Degree Area[1/]

Certification	Staff Level		
Number of Staff for a Typical Classroom	Classroom Teacher % of Column	Aide % of Column	Other % of Column
Total	100.0 (n=40)	100.0 (n=6)	100.0 (n=4)
State Certified for Special Education	25.0 (n=10)	16.7 (n=1)	25.0 (n=1)
1 Staff	40.0	33.3	*
2 or more Staff	(n=16)	(n=2)	
Other Certification	5.0	16.7	25.0
1 Staff	(n=2)	(n=1)	(n=1)
2 or More Staff	30.0 (n=12	33.3 (n=2)	25.0 (n=2)

[1/] Data are staff-specific

TABLE 10.17

(Question 8)

Provider Type by Inservice Training Type for Non-Head Start Program Training[1/]

Type of Provider	Type of Inservice Training							
	Behavior Management % of Column	Individualized Instruction % of Column	Preparation of Learning Objectives % of Column	Working With Parents % of Column	Recruitment of Handicapped Children % of Column	Screening and Assessment % of Column	Understanding Handicapping Conditions % of Column	Other % of Column
Total	100.0 (N=37)	100.0 (N=36)	100.0 (N=32)	100.0 (N=23)	100.0 (N=4)	100.0 (N=20)	100.0 (N=15)	100.0 (N=11)
Public School	21.6 (N=8)	19.4 (N=7)	21.9 (N=7)	30.4 (N=7)	25.0 (N=1)	35.0 (N=7)	20.0 (N=3)	*
University/College	24.3 (N=9)	22.2 (N=8)	12.5 (N=4)	8.7 (N=2)	*	15.0 (N=3)	26.7 (N=4)	18.1 (N=2)
Public Health Department	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9.1 (N=1)
Private Clinician	10.8 (N=4)	11.1 (N=4)	3.1 (N=1)	21.7 (N=5)	*	5.0 (N=1)	6.6 (N=1)	36.4 (N=4)
State Education Agency	5.5 (N=2)	5.6 (N=2)	6.2 (N=2)	4.4 (N=1)	25.0 (N=1)	*	*	*
Other	37.8 (N=14)	41.7 (N=15)	56.3 (N=18)	34.8 (N=8)	50.0 (N=2)	45.0 (N=9)	46.7 (N=7)	36.4 (N=4)

[1/] Data are program-specific. Each program may have offered more than one type of training and may, thus, be represented in more than one column. Data for specific recipients and hours of training is not available due to an error in the question format.

TABLE 10.18
(Question 9)

Recruitment Procedures of Non-Head Start Programs	
Recruitment Procedure	% of Total
No recruitment procedure, enrollment based on parent application	10.9 (N=5)
Have own outreach and child find activities	19.6 (N=9)
Part of established community referral system	28.3 (N=13)
Part of established community referral system and have own outreach and child find activities	34.8 (N=16)
Other	6.5 (N=3)
Total **	100 (N=46)

TABLE 10.19

(Question 9a)

Agencies That Have Referred Handicapped Children for Placement in Non-Head Start Programs	
Agency	% of Total[1/]
Private Practitioner/Consultant	80.4 (N=37)
Public Hospital	58.7 (N=27)
Public/State Health Department	76.1 (N=35)
Social Service Department	87.0 (N=40)
Public School System	89.1 (N=41)
Easter Seal Agency	28.3 (N=13)
Crippled Children Association	43.5 (N=20)
Association for Retarded Children	47.8 (N=22)
BEH First Chance Project	10.9 (N=5)
University Affiliated Facilities	39.1 (N=18)
Head Start Program	56.5 (N=26)
Other	43.5 (N=20)

[1/] Percentages are based on a total of 46 non-Head Start programs. Programs were allowed to indicate more than one referring agency.

TABLE 10.20

(Question 10)

Screening Services Provided in Non-Head Start Programs	
Screening Service Type	% of Total
Enrollees screened at time of program admission	41.3 (N=19)
Enrollees identified as handicapped before entering program	30.4 (N=14)
Other	23.9 (N=11)
No Response	4.3 (N=2)
Total**	100 (N=46)

TABLE 10.21

(Question 11)

Screening Services Provided by Non-Head Start Programs to Enrollees by Services to Non-Handicapped Children

Presence of Non-Handicapped children	Total** % of Row	Screening Services: Enrollees Identified As Handicapped Prior to Program Entry % of Row	Enrollees Screened At Time of Program Admission % of Row	Other % of Row
Programs serving only handicapped children	(N=10)	40.0 (N=4)	*	60.0 (N=6)
Programs serving handicapped and non-handicapped children	100 (N=36)	41.7 (N=15)	38.9 (N=14)	19.5 (N=7)

TABLE 10.22

(Question 11)

Type of Screening Provided in Each Screening Area by non-Head Start Programs[1/]

Type of Screening	Screening Area: Vision % of Column	Hearing % of Column	Physical Development % of Column	Speech and Language % of Column	Intellectual Development % of Column	Social/Emotional Development % of Column
Total**	100 (N=30)	100 (N=30)	100 (N=30)	100 (N=30)	100 (N=30)	100 (N=30)
General (provided to all enrollees)	43.3 (N=13)	40.0 (N=12)	40.0 (N=12)	40.0 (N=12)	33.3 (N=10)	33.3 (N=10)
Specific (provided to selected enrollees)	20.0 (N=6)	30.0 (N=9)	30.0 (N=9)	36.7 (N=11)	36.7 (N=11)	33.3 (N=10)
Do not screen in that area	36.7 (N=11)	30.0 (N=9)	30.0 (N=9)	23.3 (N=7)	30.0 (N=9)	33.3 (N=10)

1/ Includes only programs that provided screening services (N=30).

TABLE 10.23
(Question 11)

Type of Service Provider Who Performed Screening in Each Screening Area for Non-Head Start Programs

Screening Area	Providers									
	Not Reported	Psychologist/ Psychiatrist	Pediatrician/ Other Licensed Medical Professional	Speech Therapist/ Audiologist	Para-professional Medical Personnel	Social Worker	Public Health Nurse	Interdis-ciplinary Team	Staff Teacher	Other
Vision	31.2 (N=10)	*	28.1 (N=9)	*	3.1 (N=1)	*	21.9 (N=7)	9.4 (N=3)	6.2 (N=2)	25.0 (N=8)
Hearing	28.1 (N=9)	*	15.6 (N=5)	46.9 (N=15)	3.1 (N=1)	*	9.4 (N=3)	15.6 (N=5)	6.2 (N=2)	15.6 (N=5)
Physical Coordination and Development	28.1 (N=9)	*	40.6 (N=13)	*	6.2 (N=2)	6.2 (N=2)	9.4 (N=3)	18.8 (N=6)	6.2 (N=2)	31.2 (N=10)
Speech and Language	28.1 (N=9)	*	3.1 (N=1)	65.6 (N=21)	*	*	6.2 (N=2)	18.8 (N=6)	12.5 (N=4)	6.2 (N=2)
Intellectual Development	34.4 (N=11)	56.2 (N=18)	3.1 (N=1)	*	3.1 (N=1)	*	3.1 (N=1)	21.9 (N=7)	18.8 (N=6)	6.2 (N=2)
Social/ Emotional Development	31.2 (N=10)	31.2 (N=10)	3.1 (N=1)	3.1 (N=1)	3.1 (N=1)	3.1 (N=1)	3.1 (N=1)	28.1 (N=9)	25.0 (N=8)	12.5 (N=4)

Note: Only 32 Alternate programs provided screening services (including the programs that did not respond to the question related to type of screening services provided, Table 6.14). Percentages in each cell are computed on the basis of 32 rather than row or column totals because programs were allowed to indicate more than one type of provider for each screening area.

TABLE 10.24

(Question 11)

Agencies That Provided Screening Services to Non-Head Start Programs by Screening Area

Screening Area	Agency								
	Not Reported	Private Practitioner/ Consultant	Hospital	Public or State Health Department	Social Services Department	Public School System	Easter Seal Agency	University Affiliated Facilities	Other
Vision	31.2 (N=10)	21.9 (N=7)	3.1 (N=1)	12.5 (N=4)	3.1 (N=1)	25.0 (N=8)	3.1 (N=1)	9.4 (N=3)	12.5 (N=4)
Hearing	25.0 (N=8)	12.5 (N=4)	3.1 (N=1)	9.4 (N=3)	3.1 (N=1)	34.4 (N=11)	6.2 (N=2)	15.6 (N=5)	25.0 (N=8)
Physical Coordination and Development	25.0 (N=8)	37.5 (N=12)	*	6.2 (N=2)	3.1 (N=1)	21.9 (N=7)	15.6 (N=5)	6.2 (N=2)	34.4 (N=11)
Speech and Language	21.9 (N=7)	9.4 (N=3)	*	6.2 (N=2)	3.1 (N=1)	34.4 (N=11)	9.4 (N=3)	6.2 (N=2)	40.6 (N=13)
Intellectual Development	28.1 (N=9)	9.4 (N=3)	*	9.4 (N=3)	9.4 (N=3)	34.4 (N=11)	3.1 (N=1)	6.2 (N=2)	40.6 (N=13)
Social/ Emotional Development	28.1 (N=9)	9.4 (N=3)	*	12.5 (N=4)	6.2 (N=2)	34.4 (N=11)	3.1 (N=1)	9.4 (N=3)	40.6 (N=13)

Note: Only 32 Alternate programs provided screening services (including the programs that did not respond to the question related to type of screening services provided, Table 6.14). Percentages in each cell are computed on the basis of 32 rather than row or column totals because programs were allowed to indicate more than one type of provider for each screening area.

TABLE 10.25
(Question 11)

Techniques Used by Non-Head Start Programs for Screening in Vision	
Technique Type	% of Total
Not reported	56.5 (N=26)
Snellen Picture Chart	19.6 (N=9)
Opthamological Exam	8.7 (N=4)
Titmus	*
Sojourn Hand Test	*
Other formal (standardized) test	2.2 (N=1)
Locally designed instrument	2.2 (N=1)
Other	2.2 (N=1)
Don't know	8.7 (N=4)
Total **	100 (N=46)

TABLE 10.26
(Question 11)

Techniques Used by Non-Head Start Programs for Screening in Hearing

Technique Type	% of Total
Not reported	50.0 (N=23)
Pure Tone Sweep	4.3 (N=2)
Pure Tone Threshold	6.5 (N=3)
Impedence	2.2 (N=1)
Speech Reception Threshold/Speech Discrimination	*
Audiometric Exam-Technique not specified	23.9 (N=11)
Full Audiometric Exam (2 or more of the above techniques)	2.2 (N=1)
Observation	2.2 (N=1)
Other formal test	2.2 (N=1)
Don't know	6.5 (N=3)
Total**	100 (N=46)

TABLE 10.27

(Question 11)

Techniques Used by Non-Head Start Programs for Screening in Physical Coordination and Development	
Technique Type	% of Total
Not reported	50.0 (N=23)
Physical exam	17.4 (N=8)
Learning Accomplishment Profile	2.2 (N=1)
Denver Developmental Screening Test	2.2 (N=1)
Cattel Infant Intelligence Test	2.2 (N=1)
Bayley Scales of Infant Development	*
Other formal (standardized) test	10.9 (N=5)
Observation	4.3 (N=2)
Locally designed assessment	6.5 (N=3)
Don't know	4.3 (N=2)
Total **	100 (N=46)

TABLE 10.28
(Question 11)

Techniques Used by Non-Head Start Programs for Screening in Speech and Language Development	
Technique Type	% of Total
Not reported	50.0 (N=23)
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	10.9 (N=5)
Goldman Fristoe Test of Articulation	2.2 (N=1)
Carrow Test for Auditory Comprehension of Language	*
Zimmerman Pre-school Language Test	4.3 (N=2)
Illinois Test for Psycholinguistic Abilities	*
Other formal (standardized) test	8.7 (N=4)
Observation	4.3 (N=2)
Locally designed assessment	15.2 (N=7)
Don't know	4.3 (N=2)
Total**	100 (N=46)

TABLE 10.29
(Question 11)

Techniques Used by Non-Head Start Programs for Screening in Intellectual Development	
Technique Type	% of Total
Not reported	47.8 (N=22)
Denver Developmental Screening Test	2.2 (N=1)
Stanford-Binet	6.5 (N=3)
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children	2.2 (N=1)
Learning Accomplishment Profile	2.2 (N=1)
Bayley Scales of Infant Development	4.3 (N=2)
Other formal (standardized) test	15.2 (N=7)
Observation	6.5 (N=3)
Locally designed assessment	8.7 (N=4)
Don't know	4.3 (N=2)
Total **	100 (N=46)

TABLE 10.30
(Question 11)

Techniques Used by Non-Head Start Programs for Screening in Social Emotional Development	
Technique Type	% of Total
Not reported	52.2 (N=24)
Denver Developmental Screening Test	2.2 (N=1)
Vineland Social Maturity Scale	10.9 (N=5)
Bayley Scales of Infant Development	*
Learning Accomplishment Profile	*
Other formal (standardized) test	8.7 (N=4)
Observation	13.0 (N=6)
Locally designed assessment	6.5 (N=3)
Other	2.2 (N=1)
Don't know	4.3 (N=2)
Total**	100 (N=46)

TABLE 10.31

DIAGNOSTIC FILE IS DEVELOPED FOR EACH CHILD WHICH CONTAINS (A) CONFIRMATION, (B) FUNCTIONAL ASSESSMENT, (C) RECOMMENDATIONS IN NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS

(Question 12, 12a)

Diagnostic File Contains All Three Components	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
Yes	97.8 (n=45)
No	**1/
Not Specified	2.2 (n=1)

1/ Subsection 12a does not apply since no respondents omitted components.

TABLE 10.32

(Question 13)

Professionals Who Provided Confirmation of Handicap in Non-Head Start Programs by Diagnostic Area

Diagnostic Area	Provider of Confirmation						
	Psychologist/ Psychiatrist	Pediatrician Other Licensed Medical Professional	Speech Therapist/ Audiologist	Paraprofessional Medical Personnel	Interdisciplinary Team	Staff Teacher	Other 1/
Vision	2.2 (N=1)	52.2 (N=24)	2.2 (N=1)	*	13.0 (N=6)	2.2 (N=1)	23.9 (N=11)
Hearing	*	28.3 (N=13)	52.2 (N=24)	4.3 (N=2)	13.0 (N=6)	*	17.4 (N=8)
Physical Coordination and Development	8.7 (N=4)	52.2 (N=24)	*	4.3 (N=2)	26.1 (N=12)	10.9 (N=5)	23.9 (N=11)
Intellectual Development	67.4 (N=31)	4.3 (N=2)	*	*	30.4 (N=14)	8.7 (N=4)	10.9 (N=5)
Speech and Language Development	2.2 (N=1)	2.2 (N=1)	71.7 (N=33)	*	19.6 (N=9)	4.3 (N=2)	10.9 (N=5)
Social/Emotional Development	54.3 (N=25)	*	2.2 (N=1)	*	26.1 (N=12)	17.4 (N=8)	23.9 (N=11)

1/ Includes social worker and public health nurse

Note: programs were allowed to respond more than once. Percentages were derived from total number of non-Head Start programs (46).

TABLE 10.33
(Question 13)

Agencies that Provided Confirmation of Handicap in Non-Head Start Programs by Diagnostic Area

Diagnostic Area	Agency						
	Private Practitioner/ Consultant	Hospital (public)	Local or State Health/ Social Services Department	Public School System	Easter Seal/ Crippled Children Assoc./ Assoc. for Retarded Children	University Affiliated Facilities	Other
Vision	34.8 (N=16)	8.7 (N=4)	8.7 (N=4)	23.9 (N=11)	4.3 (N=2)	10.9 (N=5)	8.7 (N=4)
Hearing	23.9 (N=11)	4.3 (N=2)	8.7 (N=4)	34.8 (N=16)	6.5 (N=3)	19.6 (N=9)	21.7 (N=10)
Physical Coordination and Development	41.3 (N=19)	4.3 (N=2)	8.7 (N=4)	26.1 (N=12)	4.3 (N=2)	13.0 (N=6)	26.1 (N=12)
Intellectual Development	28.3 (N=13)	2.2 (N=1)	15.2 (N=7)	30.4 (N=14)	2.2 (N=1)	13.0 (N=6)	39.1 (N=18)
Speech and Language	17.4 (N=8)	2.2 (N=1)	4.3 (N=2)	37.0 (N=17)	6.5 (N=3)	19.6 (N=9)	39.1 (N=18)
Social/Emotional Development	26.1 (N=12)	4.3 (N=2)	15.2 (N=7)	30.4 (N=14)	2.2 (N=1)	4.3 (N=2)	47.8 (N=22)

Note: programs were allowed to respond more than once. Percentages were derived from total number of non-Head Start programs (46).

TABLE 10.34

(Question 13)

Techniques Used by Non-Head Start Programs for Confirmation of Handicap in Vision

Technique Type	% of Total
Snellen Picture Chart	13.0 (N=6)
Opthamological Exam	15.2 (N=7)
Titmus	2.2 (N=1)
Sojourn Hand Test	*
Other formal (standardized) test	17.4 (N=8)
Observation	2.2 (N=1)
Locally designed instrument	2.2 (N=1)
Other	4.3 (N=2)
Don't know	15.2 (N=7)
Not reported	45.7 (N=21)

Note: Percentages were derived from total number of non-Head Start programs (46). Programs were allowed to respond more than once.

TABLE 10.35
(Question 13)

Techniques Used by Non-Head Start Programs for Confirmation of Handicap in Hearing	
Technique Type	% of Total
Pure Tone Sweep	4.3 (N=2)
Pure Tone Threshold	13.0 (N=6)
Impedence	4.3 (N=2)
Speech Reception Threshold/Speech Discrimination	*
Audiometric Exam-Technique not specified	34.8 (N=16)
Full Audiometric Exam (2 or more of the above techniques)	10.9 (N=5)
Observation	*
Other formal test	13.0 (N=6)
Don't know	10.9 (N=5)
Not reported	28.6 (N=13)

Note: Percentages were derived from total number of non-Head Start programs (46). Programs were allowed to respond more than once.

TABLE 10.36

(Question 13)

Techniques Used by Non-Head Start Programs for Confirmation of Handicap in Physical Coordination and Development	
Technique Type	% of Total
Physical exam	23.9 (N=11)
Learning Accomplishment Profile	4.3 (N=2)
Denver Developmental Screening Test	4.3 (N=2)
Cattel Infant Intelligence Test	2.2 (N=1)
Bayley Scales of Infant Development	4.3 (N=2)
Other formal (standardized) test	30.4 (N=14)
Observation	4.3 (N=2)
Locally designed assessment	15.2 (N=7)
Don't know	8.7 (N=4)
Not reported	28.3 (N=13)

Note: Percentages were derived from total number of Alternate programs (46). Programs were allowed to respond more than once.

TABLE 10.37

(Question 13)

Techniques Used by Non-Head Start Programs for Confirmation of Handicap in Intellectual Development	
Technique Type	% of Total
Denver Developmental Screening Test	6.5 (N=3)
Stanford-Binet	30.4 (N=14)
Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children	15.2 (N=7)
Learning Accomplishment Profile	4.3 (N=2)
Bayley Scales of Infant Development	8.7 (N=4)
Other formal (standardized) test	52.2 (N=24)
Observation	4.3 (N=2)
Locally designed assessment	6.5 (N=3)
Don't know	4.3 (N=2)
Not reported	21.7 (N=10)

Note: Percentages were derived from total number of non-Head Start programs (46). Programs were allowed to respond more than once.

TABLE 10.38

(Question 13)

Techniques Used by Non-Head Start Programs for Confirmation of Handicap in Speech and Language Development

Technique Type	% of Total
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	23.9 (N=11)
Goldman Fristoe Test of Articulation	8.7 (N=4)
Carrow Test for Auditory Comprehension of Language	*
Zimmerman Pre-school Language Test	10.9 (N=5)
Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities	10.9 (N=5)
Other formal (standardized) test	47.8 (N=22)
Observation	2.2 (N=1)
Locally designed assessment	17.4 (N=8)
Don't know	8.7 (N=4)
Not reported	23.9 (N=11)

Note: Percentages were derived from total number of Alternate programs (46). Programs were allowed to respond more than once.

TABLE 10.39

(Question 13)

Techniques Used by Non-Head Start Programs for Confirmation of Handicap in Social Emotional Development	
Technique Type	% of Total
Denver Developmental Screening Test	6.5 (N=3)
Vineland Social Maturity Scale	28.3 (N=13)
Bayley Scales of Infant Development	*
Learning Accomplishment Profile	2.2 (N=1)
Other formal (standardized) test	28.3 (N=13)
Observation	26.1 (N=12)
Locally designed assessment	8.7 (N=4)
Other	4.3 (N=2)
Don't know	4.3 (N=2)
Not reported	32.6 (N=15)

Note: Percentages were derived from total number of non-Head Start programs (46). Programs were allowed to respond more than once.

TABLE 10.40

DIAGNOSTIC SERVICES FUNDED
THROUGH EPSDT IN NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS

(Question 14)

Program Has EPSDT Funded Diagnostic Services	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
No	89.1 (n=41)
Yes, on occasion	2.2 (n=1)
Yes, much of our diagnostic effort is funded through EPSDT	**
Not Indicated	8.7 (n=4)

TABLE 10.41

PARENTS INCLUDED AS PART
OF THE DIAGNOSTIC TEAM IN
NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS

(Question 15)

Parents Part of Diagnostic Team	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
No	10.9 (n=5)
Yes, but rarely	19.6 (n=9)
Yes, most of the time	67.4 (n=31)
Don't know	2.2 (n=1)

TABLE 10.42

(Question 16)

Manner in Which Diagnostic Results Are Explained to Parents in Non-Head Start Programs		
Way Explained	% within Group	% of Total by Group
Not Generally Explained	*	*
Explained by diagnostician:		26.1 (N=12)
method not specified	8.3 (N=1)	
written report	*	
verbal report	41.7 (N=5)	
written and verbal report	50.0 (N=6)	
Explained by program staff:		30.4 (N=4)
method not specified	7.1 (N=1)	
written report	*	
verbal report	21.4 (N=3)	
written and verbal report	71.4 (N=10)	
Explained by staff/ diagnostician together:		43.5 (N=20)
method not specified	*	
written report	5.0 (N=1)	
verbal report	15.0 (N=3)	
written and verbal report	80.0 (N=16)	
Total**	N=46	100 (N=46)

TABLE 10.43
(Question 17) NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS

Reason for Use of Agencies/Professionals for Diagnostic Services by Diagnostic Area							
Diagnostic Area	Reasons						
	Total ** % of Row	Least Expensive Service Available % of Row	Best Service Available % of Row	Only Service Available % of Row	Part of Established Diagnostic Service with Whice Program is Associated % of Row	No Choice in the Matter Child was Diagnosed Prior to Enrollment % of Row	Other % of Row
Vision	100 (n=36)	8.3 (n=3)	36. (n=13)	8.3 (n=3)	27.8 (n=10)	8.3 (n=3)	11.1 (n=4)
Hearing	100 (n=42)	7.1 (n=3)	31.0 (n=13)	2.4 (n=1)	40.5 (n=17)	7.1 (n=3)	11.9 (n=5)
Physical Coordination and Development	100 (n=41)	4.9 (n=2)	31.7 (n=13)	9.8 (n=4)	39.0 (n=16)	4.9 (n=2)	9.8 (n=4)
Speech & Language Development	100 (n=44)	4.5 (n=2)	31.8 (n=14)	6.8 (n=3)	43.2 (n=19)	6.8 (n=3)	6.8 (n=3)
Intellectual Development	100 (n=45)	4.4 (n=2)	24.4 (n=11)	11.1 (n=5)	46.7 (n=21)	6.7 (n=3)	6.7 (n=3)
Social Emotional Development	100 (n=42)	4.8 (n=2)	28.6 (n=12)	4.76 (n=2)	47.6 (n=20)	7.1 (n=3)	7.1 (n=3)

TABLE 10.44

(Questions 18, 18a, 18b)

Manner in Which Children's Services are Planned in Non-Head Start Programs

Manner of Planning	% of Total[1/]
Program develops Individual Plan of Services	100.0 (N=46)
Plan of Services is Written	97.8 (N=45)
Plan includes only an Educational Plan	15.2 (N=7)
Plan includes Education as well as other Service Areas	84.8 (N=39)
Other service areas included in Plan:	
Health	65.2 (N=30)
Social Services	67.4 (N=31)
Parent Involvement	80.4 (N=37)
Special Therapy	84.8 (N=39)
Other	23.9 (N=11)

[1/] Percentages derived from total number of non-Head Start programs (46).

TABLE 10.45
(Question 19)

Manner in Which Activities are Planned by Objective Area in Non-Head Start Programs

Objective Area	Manner of Planning				
	Total % of Row	Planned for Handicapped and Non-handicapped the same way % of Row	Planned for all Handicapped the same way % of Row	Planned Individually for each Handicapped child % of Row	No Response % of Row
Cognitive	100 (N=46)	4.3 (N=2)	6.5 (N=3)	89.1 (N=41)	*
Communication	100 (N=46)	2.2 (N=1)	2.2 (N=1)	95.7 (N=44)	*
Self-help	100 (N=46)	4.3 (N=2)	4.3 (N=2)	91.3 (N=42)	*
Self-concept	100 (N=46)	4.3 (N=2)	4.3 (N=2)	89.1 (N=41)	2.2 (N=1)
Gross Motor	100 (N=46)	2.2 (N=1)	8.7 (N=4)	89.1 (N-41)	*
Fine Motor	100 (N=46)	2.2 (N=1)	6.5 (N=3)	91.3 (N=42)	*
Other	100 (N=46)	*	2.2 (N=1)	30.4 (N=14)	67.4 (N=31)

TABLE 10.46

(Question 20)

Manner in Which Activities are Co. lucted by Objective Area in Non-Head Start Programs

Objective Area	Manner of Conducting Activities				
	Total % of Row	Conducted for Handicapped and Non-Handicapped the same way % of Row	Conducted for all Handicapped the same way % of Row	Often Conducted Individually for each Handicapped child % of Row	No Response % of Row
Cognitive	100 (N=46)	2.2 (N=1)	8.7 (N=4)	89.1 (N-41)	*
Communication	100 (N=46)	*	*	100.0 (N=46)	*
Self-help	100 (N=46)	4.3 (N=2)	2.2 (N=1)	93.5 (N=43)	*
Self-concept	100 (N=46)	4.3 (N=2)	4.3 (N=2)	89.1 (N=41)	2.2 (N=1)
Gross Motor	100 (N=46)	*	8.7 (N=4)	91.3 (N=42)	*
Fine Motor	100 (N=46)	*	4.3 (N=2)	89.1 (N=41)	6.5 (N=3)
Other	100 (N=46)	2.2 (N=1)	*	6.5 (N=3)	91.3 (N=42)

(Question 21)

Data for this question is not available.

TABLE 10.47

(Question 21a)

Distribution of Written Curricula used by Objective Area in Non-Head Start Programs

Objective Area	Curriculum						
	Total ** % of Row	Locally Designed Materials % of Row	Peabody % of Row	Learning Accomplishment Profile (LAP) % of Row	Other % of Row	Portage Project Curriculum % of Row	Written Curricula Not Used % of Row
Cognitive	100 (N=46)	37.0 (N=17)	8.7 (N=4)	4.3 (N=2)	19.6 (N=9)	8.7 (N=4)	21.7 (N=10)
Communication	100 (N=46)	39.1 (N=18)	10.9 (N=5)	4.3 (N=2)	15.2 (N=7)	8.7 (N=4)	21.7 (N=10)
Self-help	100 (N=46)	50.0 (N=23)	2.2 (N=1)	4.3 (N=2)	10.9 (N=5)	8.7 (N=4)	23.9 (N=11)
Self-concept	100 (N=46)	45.7 (N=21)	2.2 (N=1)	4.3 (N=2)	10.9 (N=5)	4.3 (N=2)	32.6 (N=15)
Gross Motor	100 (N=46)	39.1 (N=18)	4.3 (N=2)	6.5 (N=3)	17.4 (N=8)	8.7 (N=4)	23.9 (N=11)
Fine Motor	100 (N=46)	39.1 (N=18)	4.3 (N=2)	6.5 (N=3)	17.4 (N=8)	8.7 (N=4)	23.9 (N=11)
Other	100 (N=46)	19.6 (N=9)	2.2 (N=1)	2.2 (N=1)	2.2 (N=1)	2.2 (N=1)	71.7 (N=33)

TABLE 10.48

(Question 21a)

Distribution of Performance or Experienced Based Curricula by Objective Area for those Non-Head Start Programs in which Specific Written Curricula were Used

Objective Area	Curriculum Orientation			
	Total ** % of Row	Performance Based % of Row	Experience Based % of Row	Mixed % of Row
Total	100 (N=207)	44.4 (N=92)	13.5 (N=28)	42.0 (N=87)
Cognitive	100 (N=36)	38.9 (N=14)	13.9 (N=5)	47.2 (N=17)
Communication Skills	100 (N=36)	44.4 (N=16)	11.1 (N=4)	44.4 (N=16)
Self-help	100 (N=35)	45.7 (N=16)	17.1 (N=6)	37.1 (N=13)
Self-concept	100 (N=32)	37.5 (N=12)	15.6 (N=5)	46.9 (N=15)
Gross motor	100 (N=34)	50.0 (N=17)	11.8 (N=4)	38.2 (N=13)
Fine Motor	100 (N=34)	50.0 (N=17)	11.8 (N=4)	38.2 (N=13)

(Question 22)

Data for this question is not available.

TABLE 10.49

(Question 22a)

Monitoring Techniques Used by Non-Head Start Programs by Frequency of Application

Frequency	Monitoring Technique					
	Formal (Standardized) Tests % of Column	Assessments That Are Part of Specific Curriculum Package % of Column	Teacher/Center Designed Assessment % of Column	Unstructured Observation % of Column	Parent Report % of Column	Other % of Column
Total[1]	54.3 (N=25)	39.1 (N=18)	76.1 (N=35)	65.2 (N=30)	60.9 (N=28)	28.3 (N=13)
Weekly	*	*	20.0 (N=7)	56.7 (N=17)	7.1 (N=2)	7.7 (N=1)
Monthly	8.0 (N=2)	5.6 (N=1)	20.0 (N=7)	10.0 (N=3)	32.1 (N=9)	30.8 (N=4)
Twice a Year	40.0 (N=10)	38.9 (N=7)	14.3 (N=5)	*	7.1 (N=2)	*
Yearly	28.0 (N=7)	5.6 (N=1)	*	*	3.6 (N=1)	15.4 (N=2)
Other	24.0 (N=6)	50.0 (N=9)	45.7 (N=16)	33.3 (N=10)	50.0 (N=14)	46.2 (N=6)

[1] Percentages in the "total" row are based on a sample size of 46 programs and, thus, reflect the percentage of the programs that used each type of technique for monitoring purposes. All other percentages within each column are based on the total within the column rather than on the total number of non-Head Start programs.

TABLE 10.50

(Question 23)

Professionals Used for Provision of Services by Non-Head Start Programs

Professional	Total Programs Served[1/]	Involvement Area[2/] Works With Child at Another Site	Works With Child in the Classroom	Trains/Consults With Teacher	Trains Parents	Evaluates Child's Progress	Observes in Classroom	Other
Physician	63.0 (N=29)	69.0 (N=20)	*	48.3 (N=14)	34.5 (N=10)	51.7 (N=15)	6.9 (N=2)	13.8 (N=4)
Nurse	47.8 (N=22)	63.6 (N=14)	54.5 (N=12)	90.9 (N=20)	68.2 (N=15)	54.5 (N=12)	45.4 (N=10)	4.5 (N=1)
Psychologist/ Psychiatrist	78.3 (N=36)	50.0 (N=18)	36.1 (N=13)	86.1 (N=31)	50.0 (N=18)	94.4 (N=34)	63.9 (N=23)	13.9 (N=5)
Speech Pathologist/ Therapist	73.9 (N=34)	64.7 (N=22)	70.6 (N=24)	76.5 (N=26)	58.8 (N=20)	91.2 (N=31)	73.5 (N=25)	14.7 (N=5)
Social Worker	60.9 (N=28)	39.3 (N=11)	28.6 (N=8)	85.7 (N=24)	85.7 (N=24)	53.6 (N=15)	50.0 (N=14)	25.0 (N=7)
Nutritionist/ Dietician	32.6 (N=15)	40.0 (N=6)	6.7 (N=1)	66.7 (N=10)	60.0 (N=9)	26.7 (N=4)	6.7 (N=1)	26.7 (N=4)
Certified Special Education Teacher	58.7 (N=27)	44.4 (N=12)	92.6 (N=25)	55.6 (N=15)	70.4 (N=19)	92.6 (N=25)	70.4 (N=19)	18.5 (N=5)
Physical Therapist	63.0 (N=29)	65.5 (N=19)	55.2 (N=16)	72.4 (N=21)	62.1 (N=18)	75.9 (N=22)	48.3 (N=14)	17.2 (N=5)
Occupational Therapist	37.0 (N=17)	58.8 (N=10)	58.8 (N=10)	88.2 (N=15)	58.8 (N=10)	88.2 (N=15)	64.7 (N=11)	17.6 (N=3)
Opthamologist/ Optometrist	34.8 (N=16)	93.8 (N=15)	12.5 (N=2)	31.2 (N=5)	31.2 (N=5)	68.8 (N=11)	6.2 (N=1)	12.5 (N=2)
Other Specialist	45.7 (N=21)	66.7 (N=14)	33.3 (N=7)	52.4 (N=11)	52.4 (N=11)	66.7 (N=14)	28.6 (N=6)	14.3 (N=3)

[1/] Percentages for this column are based on the total number of programs in the sample (N=46). For example, 29 programs, or 63 percent of the programs, used physicians to provide services to their handicapped children.

[2/] Percentages for each row of involvement are based on the total number of programs that used the corresponding type of professional. For example, in 20 programs physicians worked with children at another site, or in 69 percent of the programs that used physicians.

TABLE 10.51

(Question 24a)

Agencies With Which Non-Head Start Programs Coordinated Services to Handicapped Children	
Agency	% of Total[1/]
Private Practitioner/Consultant	61.9 (N=26)
Public Hospital	40.5 (N=17)
Public or State Health Department	66.7 (N=28)
Social Services Department	80.9 (N=34)
Public School System	83.3 (N=35)
Easter Seals	42.8 (N=18)
Crippled Children's Association	42.8 (N=18)
Association for Retarded Children	47.6 (N=20)
BEH First Chance Project	9.5 (N=4)
University Affiliated Facilities	33.3 (N=14)
Head Start	40.5 (N=17)
Other	35.7 (N=15)

[1/] Percentages are based on a total of 42 programs that coordinated services for their handicapped children with other agencies either occasionally or extensively. Programs could indicate more than one agency.

(Question 24)

Data for this question is not available.

TABLE 10.52

HOW INTERAGENCY COORDINATION
IS GENERALLY ESTABLISHED IN
NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS

(Question 24b)

Coordination Generally Established by:	% of Non-head Start Programs (n=46)[1]
We usually initiate contact after children enroll and needs are identified	45.7 (n=46)
Other agencies generally contact us after children enroll	6.5 (n=3)
Agencies generally providing services prior to child's enrollment	8.7 (n=4)
Other	26.1 (n=12)
Not Specified	13.0 (n=6)

[1] Programs could indicate more than one response.

TABLE 10.53

NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS
WITH AN ADVISORY COUNCIL
OR PROGRAM BOARD THAT INCLUDES PARENTS AS FULL MEMBERS

(Question 25)

Parent as Full Members of Program Board or Council	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
Yes	80.4 (n=37)
No	19.6 (n=9)

TABLE 10.54

INVOLVEMENT OF PARENTS
IN NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS

(Question 26)

Involvement of Parents	% of Non-Head Start Programs (n=46)
Very Active	30.4 (n=14)
Average involvement	50.0 (n=23)
Only minor involvement	19.6 (n=9)
Do not participate at all	**

TABLE 10.55

(Question 27)

General Program Activities in Which Parents of Handicapped Children in Non-Head Start Programs Were Typically Involved

Involvement	% of Programs[1/]
Provide transportation	63.0 (N=29)
Train/counsel other parents	37.0 (N=17)
Involvement in outreach/recruitment	50.0 (N=23)
Develop community resource file	15.2 (N=7)
Develop objectives for social service/ parent involvement activities	39.1 (N=18)
Make/donate materials for classroom	63.0 (N=29)
Involved in functions with other parents	47.8 (N=22)
Other	56.5 (N=26)

1/ Percentages are based on the total of 46 nor-Head Start programs.

TABLE 10.56

(Question 28)

Training Received by Parents in Non-Head Start Programs	
Training Areas	% of Programs[1/]
Program goals and objectives	65.2 (N=30)
Normal child growth and development	45.7 (N=21)
Identifying special needs of their children	82.6 (N=38)
Educational planning	65.2 (N=30)
Availability of other community resources	84.8 (N=39)
Legal rights related to their child	58.7 (N=27)
Genetic counseling	21.7 (N=10)
Information concerning their child's specific handicap	89.1 (N=41)
Home management of child/activities for parents to do with child	91.3 (N=42)
Other	45.7 (N=21)

[1/] Percentages are based on a total of 46 non-Head Start programs.

TABLE 10.57
NON-HEAD START PROGRAM PARENT
TRAINING PROVIDED INDIVIDUALLY
AS NEEDED OR AS A GENERAL
TRAINING PROJECT

(Question 28a)

Parent Training Individualized or General	% of all Non-Head Start Programs (N=46)
Individually as Needed (Generally)	54.3 (N=25)
General parent training program (Generally)	4.3 (N=2)
Both	37.0 (N=17)
Not specified	4.3 (N=2)

TABLE 10.58
AGE OF NON-HEAD START
HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

(Question 29)

Age	% of Total[1/]
3 years old	7.1 (N=21)
4 years old	23.6 (N=70)
5 years old	29.3 (N=87)
Other	40.1 (N=119)
Total	100 (N=297)

1/ Percentages based on total of 297 children reported enrolled in programs.

TABLE 10.59
HANDICAPPED CHILDREN ENROLLED
IN NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS
FOR TWO OR MORE YEARS

(Question 29a)

Children Enrolled Two or More Years	% of Non-Head Start Programs (N=46)
1	23.9 (N=11)
2	8.7 (N=4)
3	6.5 (N=3)
4	4.3 (N=2)
5	6.5 (N=3)
6	2.2 (N=1)
7	2.2 (N=1)
8	2.2 (N=1)
9	4.3 (N=2)
10	2.2 (N=1)
Children in program less than two years.	37.0 (N=17)

TABLE 10.60
ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS FOR
A HANDICAPPED CHILD IN
NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS
(Question 30)

Entrance Requirements	% of Non-Head Start Programs (N=46)
Chronological age	63.0 (N=29)
Certain handicapping condition(s)	69.6 (N=32)
Certain severity level of these handicapping conditions	43.5 (N=20)
Must be ambulatory	8.7 (N=4)
Must be toilet trained	10.9 (N=5)
Must be functioning at a minimum developmental level	17.4 (N=8)
Parents must make a commitment to participate in the program	21.7 (N=10)
Family must meet income guidelines	6.5 (N=3)
Family must be able to pay tuition	4.3 (N=2)
Child must have received professional diagnosis	50.0 (N=23)
Other	30.4 (N=14)

TABLE 10.61

TOTAL FUNDING FOR 1977
IN NON-HEAD START PROGRAMS

(Question 31)

Total Funding	% of Non-Head Start Programs (N=46)
$ 4,000 - 50,000	26.1 (N=12)
$ 51,000 - 200,000	26.1 (N=12)
$201,000 - 500,000	23.9 (N=11)
$501,000 - 1,000,000	4.3 (N=2)
Over $1,000,000	10.9 (N=5)
Not Specified	8.7 (N=4)

(Questions 32, 33)

The data for these questions were incomplete and inaccurate so no tables were generated.